DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 237 SP 007 469

TITLE	Social Change and Teacher Education. Proceedings of the Biennial School for Executives of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (15th, University of Virginia, August 16-22, 1970).
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	60p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Change; School Community Cooperation; *School Community Programs; *School Community Relationship; *Social Change

ABSTRACT

This is a compendium of papers from this week-long session. The keynote paper, of the same name as the booklet title, was written by the Honorable Joseph M. Montoya, senator from New Mexico. Other topics discussed are multicultural education, the need for individual involvement in school-community relations, campus change, a forum on the National Institute of Education, and accountability and social change. (JB)

ED 084237

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AACTE
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Social Change and Teacher Education

Proceedings of the
15th Biennial
School for Executives
of the American Association
of Colleges for Teacher Education
at the University of Virginia
in Charlottesville
August 16-22, 1970

SP 007 469

Published by the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF COLLEGES
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Copyright © 1972 by
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

Standard Book Number: 910052-56-5
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 75-76466

Foreword

The 15th Biennial School for Executives devoted its professional program to the role of teacher education in the shifting sands of our social order. The impact of changing conditions in the communities, in the schools, and in the nation has long evidenced that the preparation of school personnel faces new needs and challenges.

Participants in the week-long sessions considered organizational, institutional, and governmental problems. The AACTE Special Study Commission reported on its two-year assignment to chart new directions for the Association, recommending internal steps to be taken immediately. Other segments of the program, recorded in these pages, addressed the broader issues which must concern all interested in the quality of our educational system.

The University of Virginia, founded by Thomas Jefferson in 1825, provided an historical setting for this 15th in AACTE's series of summer conferences for teacher educators and their families. The Association is indebted to Dean Frederick R. Cyphert and his wife, Lois, for their hospitality and for the many hours they worked to help make the meeting a success; the warm welcome of President and Mrs. Edgar F. Shannon, Jr. was greatly appreciated. Under the chairmanship of Dean Bob G. Woods of the University of Missouri-Columbia, the School for Executives Planning Committee shaped a meaningful program, translated into reality by AACTE Associate Directors Richard L. James and Walter J. Mars. To all these people and their unnamed associates, the Association is deeply grateful.

EDWARD C. POMEROY
Executive Director
December 1971

School for Executives Planning Committee

Bob G. Woods, Chairman
Dean, College of Education
University of Missouri
Columbia

Richard B. Brooks
Dean, School of Education
The College of William
and Mary in Virginia
Williamsburg

Lewis A. Jackson
Director of Graduate Studies
Central State University
Wilberforce, Ohio

Frederick R. Cyphert
Dean, School of Education
University of Virginia
Charlottesville

Mrs. J. Lawrence Walkup
President, NAWPDMIAACTE
(AACTE Wives)

Richard L. James
Associate Director, AACTE

Walter J. Mars
Associate Director, AACTE

Contents

Foreword
Edward C. Pomeroy iii

Social Change and Teacher Education
Joseph M. Montoya 1

Insights Into Multicultural Education
Herman R. Branson 6
J. B. Jones 9
Charles F. Leyba 13

The Need for Individual Commitment
C. T. Vivian 17

Preparation for Campus Change
John E. King 25

A Forum on the National Institute of Education
Roger E. Levien 31

Accountability and Social Change
Leon M. Lessinger 45
David D. Darland 52

School for Executives:
A Twenty-eight Year Tradition

1942/Clear Lake Camp, Michigan

1944/Jackson's Mill, West Virginia

1946/Lake Chautauqua, New York

1948/Estes Park, Colorado

1950/University of Wisconsin, Madison

1952/Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti

1954/State University of New York, College at Buffalo

1956/University of Wyoming, Laramie

1958/University of Connecticut, Storrs

1960/Bemidji State College, Bemidji, Minnesota

1962/Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff

1964/State University of New York, College at Oneonta

1966/Northern Michigan University, Marquette

1968/Southern Oregon College, Ashland

1970/University of Virginia, Charlottesville

Social Change and Teacher Education

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
United States Senator
New Mexico

Nearly one-third of the people of New Mexico have Spanish surnames. Another significant portion of New Mexico, some eight percent, belongs to the Indian tribes which make their homes in the state. This has made me well aware, over the years, of special problems confronting those Americans who retain their distinct cultural identity. We tend to define this problem in terms of several different minorities adjusting to a predominant American culture, yet in reality, this predominant culture we speak of is multicultural in nature. It is this variety of cultural input that has given America her strength. Our Spanish-speaking population, numbering more than five million, is the second largest minority in our country. Included are nearly one million Puerto Ricans living in New York City, and some 100,000 Cuban refugees in Florida. More than four million of these people are urban dwellers. Their ties to their respective cultures are strengthened by everyday use of their mother tongues.

Why are we a unilingual nation? Why do we have a mental block, collectively, as a nation, to a second language, when other nations of the world are multilingual? I think I have the answer: the United States of America is a nation of immigrants, who, when they came here, wanted to join the mainstream. They were told, "You and your children speak nothing but English. Forget your old ties. This is America." They adopted that kind of thinking, and they told their children, "Don't speak German, don't speak Italian, don't speak Gallic," and so, eventually, they lost their ties with their mother countries.

There is only one minority in this country which defied that tradition and that teaching. The Mexican-American population of this country has spoken Spanish for 400 years in New Mexico, and now it speaks both languages. It is the only remaining minority that has language ties with its mother country. I think it is an asset to be bilingual. In this fast age of communication, Latin America is coming upon us, and those who can speak the two languages will have a treasure and a great human resource that will benefit this country commercially and otherwise. That is why I think it is important to imbue people with the desire and motivation to learn more than one language, to apprise themselves of the multicultural composition of this great nation of ours.

In addition to those for whom English is a second language or even a completely foreign language, there are others who preserve their own cultural en-

clave. Sometimes they preserve what could even be called a dialect of English. There are rural Americans, Americans of Appalachia, to whom the city life that is now a reality for a majority of Americans seems as foreign as cultures of Asia would be to most city dwellers. There are millions of black Americans, poor whites, and several ethnic groups for whom life just across town seems like another world. It could well be said that America is a majority of minorities, but this cultural diversity also poses a problem.

The minority individual must be able to adapt to this diversity in order to be successful in daily interactions with society at large. Often his experiences in a more sheltered mixed community do not equip him effectively for this, and alienation and bitterness are the resulting harvest. For this reason, I feel the educational system must play an increasingly important role in the life of the minority community. It is crucial because the school is, in all likelihood, the first place in which the child confronts the larger culture that is so foreign to him. Until recently one viewpoint predominated among educators: a minority group was culturally disadvantaged and would have to adapt to the mainstream of American society sooner or later; therefore, the responsibility of the educational system, especially in the early years, was to introduce the child, or rather to impose upon him, a white middle class outlook. This was carried to the point of almost total exclusion of the child's indigenous culture. The harder this policy was pressed, the more defensive its targets became.

Today, many educators are coming to recognize the dangers in such an outlook. In the first place, it backfires. In effect, it further alienates the child, thereby causing him to withdraw even more into his own culture. With the teacher speaking in unfamiliar terms to him and using words he does not understand, the child cannot achieve the success necessary for him to develop self-confidence. Lack of success reinforces what many experiences have impressed upon him—namely, that his minority identity is something inferior, something undesirable. This cultural exclusion may not always be the conscious intent of the teacher, as stated in *Teachers for the Real World*, the report of AACTE's NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth. Instead of preparing teachers to be at ease with children of any social origin, colleges are typically preparing teachers for children who are much like themselves.

Teacher educators must help the teacher realize that he is the key intermediary between the child and American society. The teacher shapes the child's conceptions of society, and if those conceptions do not correspond to realities the child perceives, he will begin to lose faith in the relevance of the educational system. An effective teacher is a person the student trusts, and a person the student trusts is one who understands his world. If a teacher does not relate to the reality of the child's world, he becomes worse than ineffective. He becomes irrelevant. But even if a teacher is able to understand the child, cultural bias may still seep through. As I said before, America gains her strength from cultural diversity. The enduring heritage of American minorities is something to be proud of, not to stamp out. Ignoring these cultures, or disparaging them in schools, will only heighten feelings of inferiority and insecurity. It is important that the child develop a self-concept of personal competence at an early age. If the teacher treats the child's minority background with proper respect, this

will legitimize that background in the eyes of the child. Imparting to him the pride he so desperately needs will, at the same time, increase his interest in education.

Children who learn about their own heritage will be able to become better citizens with a wider knowledge of the many heritages of our nation. It is entirely possible to promote pride and loyalty to diverse races, religions, and nationalities while preparing people to live in a unified nation. In speaking of cultures and heritages, I am referring not only to ethnic groups whose identities derive from one country, but also to rural people, Americans of Appalachia, and ghetto dwellers, who have as much a culture and life style as ethnic minorities. It is important for a teacher who goes into the ghetto to understand what is commonly referred to as "street language" and the way a black youth perceives police. So must the teacher in the barrio understand traditional patterns of family relationships among Spanish-speaking Americans.

Urban education is but one of the areas requiring specialized attention. Teacher training methods must involve regionalization, consisting of local seminars in which a teacher is sensitized to the needs of the community he will serve. Commensurate with this should be an increase in the number of teachers who are themselves from minority backgrounds. Equally important would be exposure to as broad a spectrum of cultures as possible.

The widest education gap exists in those communities in which a language other than English is the mother tongue. Children from these areas have two strikes against them: not only do they face the problem of relating to their teachers, but they also are unable to overcome this barrier because they aren't fluent in English. I think we all agree that it is essential for all children eventually to become fluent in English if they are to be successful in American society. But I think we also agree that it is essential for students and teachers to be able to communicate, especially at an early age when a child is developing most of his basic learning skills.

We must recognize that the child who comes from a home in which another language is spoken, is most comfortable with that language. It is an intolerable burden for him to have to learn English as well as his regular studies. He is saddled with a severe handicap, and it is not surprising that the average Spanish-speaking child in the Southwest drops out of school by the seventh year, and that in Texas, only 11 percent graduate from high school. Minority children, as a rule, tend to fall several grades behind national norms in their educational progress. Emphasis on multicultural education could redress much of this imbalance.

Dr. Bruce Gardner, of the U. S. Office of Education, has proposed a very simple policy as the basis for bilingual programs, to which I heartily subscribe. The child's first schooling would be entirely in the mother tongue, and he would be made literate in this language. English would then be introduced orally in the first grade as a second language. From this point on, both languages would be used, with the first language being phased out to one-third of the school day by the sixth grade and to one academic subject throughout high school. In such a program, the youngster would not lose time and interest from the very beginning by being doubly burdened with learning school work and English at the same time. Nearly five million school children are in serious need

of a bilingual program such as this; most of them are Spanish-speaking.

It was precisely with such an idea in mind that I have sought bilingual education legislation. In 1967 I co-authored with Senator Yarborough the Bilingual Education Act, which sought to equalize opportunities for achievement of the non-English-speaking student both in the classroom and in the employment market. The program was also designed to impart to minority students a knowledge of the history and culture associated with their language, instilling in them a healthy attitude toward it as well as an appreciation of their heritage and its contributions to American society. Later, I helped secure inclusion of this act as Title 7 of the 1967 Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments.

Money for programs has been slow in coming, unfortunately. In July 1968, I testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee, seeking full funding of the program at the $30 million level authorized for fiscal year 1969. Funding at this level would have meant that 250,000 children could have benefited from this program; however, a compromise between the House and the Senate resulted in appropriations of only $7.5 million that year. For fiscal year 1971, the President recommended only $12 million, despite congressional authorization of an $18 million ceiling. I introduced an amendment in the Senate, and we got the figure raised to $30 million. That figure was sustained by the House in conference, and that's what we had for the last fiscal year.

During the present session of Congress, I have introduced legislation that would earmark special appropriations to train teachers for bilingual education programs. Under existing law, funds for these programs were lumped together with funds for other programs. I feel it is important that the bilingual program be given high priority and that its funds not be lost in the shuffle. Perhaps I should explain to you what this bilingual program is doing in areas which have been selected for pilot programs.

I have visited most of these areas. Before the children are of age to go into the first grade, they are enrolled in the school and taught how to read and speak fluently in their mother tongue. They are taught about their culture and to be proud of their heritage. Little by little, without too much lapse of time, they are moved into English.

I have seen these projects. The children have read the Spanish words on one side of the blackboard for me and then flawlessly read the English words on the other side. They have learned to appreciate their culture. They walk into the classroom with heads high and shoulders proud. They do not feel isolated in that classroom. They feel superior because they know two languages and their counterparts know only one language. That's what this bilingual program is all about, and that's why this year, I propose that we train bilingual teachers; there is a shortage of them. I know that is what you are concerned with in this seminar—developing methods for better teacher education so that teachers can go out and teach these children with full comprehension of their background.

I feel that these programs are important, and I will seek further levels of funding for them; however, we can only do so much. What is really needed is an attitude change among educators. If a new emphasis, a new sensitivity, were imparted during teacher preparation, the necessary changes would be effected sooner. Organizations like AACTE have been in the forefront of this movement, and I hope they will continue to be. Many politicians in the past several decades

have made far-reaching commitments to equal educational opportunity. We have legislation to assist poor school districts to upgrade themselves. We have tried to ensure that no child is denied the right of a good education because of discrimination, but we must recognize that equality in the sense of similar school facilities, teaching methods, and instructional materials is not actual equality for significant portions of the nation's school children.

In failing to give them the special attention they need and deserve, we are passing them by. The teacher education community and we in Congress must address ourselves to this problem. We must not lose these children. We must ask you people who are knowledgeable in this field to try to close the gap, to provide methods and techniques so that we can reach all these children at a young age. For until we educate them and make them equals in the mainstream of educational society, we can only say that America is not fulfilling its great responsibility. Only when we face the challenge and conquer the problem, can we justly say that in America there is equality in the educational process.

Insights Into Multicultural Education

HERMAN R. BRANSON
President
Central State University
Wilberforce, Ohio

In 1970 we find ourselves using instruments of the 16th century to plan for the civilization of the 21st. It can be said almost without contradiction that the magnificent achievements of our cities have not by any means affected the way in which we consider ourselves and the way in which we view our society. Therefore when we speak of multicultural education, we must speak in terms of what we are now armed with—and what, therefore, we can use.

The last 30 years have seen two unusual developments. First, we have discovered that we are truly alone on this little spaceship, earth, hurtling through space, taking up a position around a rather little, insignificant star, and yet with all that, we have a system which is essentially closed except for energy coming in from outside. But we learned just about 30 years ago that we seem to have at our disposal an inexhaustible source of energy. We could have been most pessimistic about the future. If you had asked me when I was a graduate student, I would have told you that man's future looked bleak indeed, depending as it did upon fossil fuels. We could not have gone very much longer, maybe a few hundred years. But the discovery of nuclear energy really has pushed us back several thousand years, and we know that our sources of uranium and thorium, for example, are sufficient to give the world energy for the next three or four thousand years.

We also know that in the next few years someone is going to find how we can take our resources and do what the sun can do. Arnold Toynbee has said that for the first time in the history of mankind, we can bring the advantages of civilization to all the peoples of the earth. That is our most important concept; the second one is that we have learned a tremendous amount about ourselves.

Once upon a time it was very easy for people to believe that anybody living on the other side of the mountain was, by that fact alone, inferior. Whatever quality we possessed must have been a superior quality. If we were redheaded, obviously redheadedness was superior, and if we were black (everybody knows black is beautiful), that put us ahead; if we were yellow, there were more of us in the world than anybody else, so we must be the most significant people. This type of thinking could have gone on, but thanks to the development of such things as cultural anthropology and bio-chemogenetics, we know that we are really one people, wherever we are found over the surface of the earth.

The one thing we need to do is find out how we can use our resources to make this world a more habitable and enjoyable place than we are now making it. The number one requirement of all of us who are in teaching is to get this information across.

It should be fairly easy for us to approach multicultural education with an assurance that we can succeed. But that is not enough. We find that, perhaps because of our Puritan tradition, perhaps because of our social thinking, we have a tremendous job before us of re-educating society. People refuse to believe that education is advantageous to society. They want to believe that education is primarily of benefit to the individual, and therefore, if John Jones who lives in the ghetto up in Cleveland fails to realize his potential, that's a loss to John Jones. But you and I must insist that this is a loss to society. Our primary concern, therefore, must be to give our young people the social and intellectual habits they need to work within this extremely complex society. We can't do much about multicultural education or any kind of education until we can convince people that the school is the most important social agency for realizing society's potential. That is my second point.

My third and concomitant point is that if a child's education is not a privilege but a necessity for society, then the teacher himself must accept a different set of accountabilities. When the teacher walks into his algebra class, he does not open that class as it has been opened since antediluvian times, with the statement: "This is a class in algebra. We are using this book; we'll start on page 32 and do the exercises. Are there any questions?" Rather, he will ask himself how he can single out that youngster there who may be reluctant, who may have difficulty. How can he make this meaningful to him? How can he make him see that this is an essential skill? If a teacher asks questions like these, I'm confident he will find that multicultural and all education becomes an easier job. The teacher must accept the fact that the child before him has almost limitless possibilities.

My final point is that if we accept these three things, then in working with teachers who are dealing with difficult young people, young people who have not had the full advantage of our society, there is another attitude which is essential for us to work on. It says, in effect, that if I have someone in my class, I can teach that youngster anything to an honest, honorable level. Of course we have been challenged on that, but I believe that this is fundamental to modern education. Whatever the topic is, it becomes our requirement and our responsibility to aid the student in gaining the understanding he needs. What this really implies, if we do it well, is an individualized instructional program. It means that we can't have hundreds of kids in our classes.

So in 1970 we find that we need to have in ourselves a different view of the nature of man and his society, which respects, especially, the discoveries of the last 30 years. Second, we must think in terms of the whole problem of education and what it does. It is not simply advantageous to the individual, but, much more significant, it is of great advantage to our society. It is the only thing we have to lead us in the future.

The third concept is that we must generate in ourselves and in our teachers a higher sense of accountability, a feeling that when we go into a classroom, we are not there to throw our knowledge as grain on a field, but rather to teach, to

bring forth. Finally, if we have these three attitudes, then we can teach anything to anyone who presents himself to us. If we do that, the millenium will be at hand.

J. B. JONES
Professor
Department of Psychology and Guidance
Texas Southern University, Houston

I have been asked to address myself to the question, "What problems must an institution recognize and address itself to in order to offer equal opportunity to all?" Obviously, I must speak as a member of a predominantly black college faculty. This may not give me a top-of-the-bridge view, but there appears among you, I hope, the climate for echoes from the valley.

New York University reports that the five most pressing problems in education are discipline, buildings, physical facilities, teachers, finance, and integration. I am willing to concede the urgency which characterizes each of the foregoing. It is easier to deplore our educational plight than it is to change it. Unfortunately, the multicultural approach was omitted in the earlier stages of our educational system, and trying to reform this giant business enterprise is like trying to change tires on a moving car. Some call it a band-aid on cancer approach. One thing is clear to educators: change cannot be sermonized into existence; there must be pragmatists who can transform ideas into real programs. How can we provide experiences which will serve as a change catalyst for individuals of varied backgrounds? How can we keep a sense of open-endedness for learning? I constantly ask, how can Texas Southern University promote the growth of each student as an integrator, interpreter, excellent performer, articulator, social architect, or, simply stated, a unique individual? This question takes on greater dimensions and implications if I imagined that the student body of Texas Southern University were truly representative of the population of Texas.

I contend that an institution may have an entirely black student population and still must engage in multicultural education. Multicultural education emphasizes the need for institutions to address the infinite demands which are being placed upon them while resources provided are finite. Each to his farthest star is an ideal goal, but this can become mere rhetoric if prescriptive and diagnostic capabilities and resources are not present.

Thoreau chided us to permit each to march to that music which he hears, and cautioned that there will be those who will be out of step with their time for they march to the tune of distant beats. How capable is an institution of determining who is out of step? What is expected by the public, the board of directors, the faculty, and the student body of an institution? Cultural transmis-

sion may be foremost in the minds of a dominant group, with or without the acceptance of the duality or the multiplicity of culture. Under such a demand for cultural transmission, an institution which must respond to the heightened emphasis of economic mobility may find its resources so diffused that ineffectiveness in both areas ensues. One black college president refers to his institution as the bridge from the cotton patch to Class-A rose. He is interpreting his institution's role as one of encouraging self-discovery and stimulation of the individual. He expects to bring his students from where they are and give them a view of the mainstream and the alternatives for becoming a part. He makes no claims of putting them into the mainstream, and thus he addresses himself to a vertical application of education.

Alumni of another black college refer to it as the "Little Harvard." Obviously these individuals would like their alma mater to address itself to the training of select individuals who indicate ability to master a highly verbal curriculum. They would address themselves to professionally oriented personalities. Thus we have a horizontal involvement. This means that I would ask colleges and universities how capable they are of preparing a Mexican-American to work with migrant farmers in the Rio Grande valley. I would ask Rice University its resources for and its dedication to preparation of teachers for the rural areas of east Texas. I would ask Grambling College the expertise it has for taking a high school graduate from Pointe Coupee Parish and readying him in four years for a position as a teacher on the black South Side of Chicago.

Institutions must establish priorities and distribute resources accordingly. This is not a new mandate. I am confident that this is what the accrediting agencies had in mind when they described as one of the evaluative features the determination of an institution's philosophy and the extent to which it is internalized by constituent groups. I am herein admitting that our institutions have not the resources to be all things to all people and should clearly state their specialties so as to avoid development of an alienated, disenchanted youth cult.

Secondly, multicultural education must establish continuity with the past. There can be no denial of the fact that teachers activate certain educational channels and neglect or shun others. I am not calling for education to be an exercise in story-telling, nor am I asking that young people be pushed to radical edges in an effort to find solutions. It is not enough, however, to ask the raped victim, "How did you let this happen to you?" We must question the rapist as to his aggression and degradation.

We can hardly anticipate a continuous cultural future for American students. This is recognized by the theme of our week's study—"Social Change and Teacher Education." Students must deal with an environment that is discontinuous. They must sense values that divide us and also values that unify us. Institutions must abandon the position, "I have the recipe for sugar pie," and instead raise issues and allow attitudes to fall out. It is time to leave the emotional state of bewilderment and desperation and return to rigorous intellectual debate and investigation in institutions. It would serve well in a multicultural setting to microscopically view the 40-year period from 1930 to the present as it relates particularly to minority groups. At the beginning of that era there were 11,891,000 Negroes in the United States, with four-fifths of them living in

the District of Columbia and the 16 states which maintained separate school systems. W. E. B. DuBois, with three million black boys and girls five to 17 years of age as his concern, enumerated 40 years ago that race relations, increased financial support, and revised educational policies were the most pressing issues in our education. He was declaring that the identity of educational offerings, with respect to goals and content, was producing an underprivileged group. He declared that education for black citizens was regarded as accidental rather than essential.

Permit me to quote from DuBois: He said, "From our survey of colored schools of the state of Georgia, we are led to certain conclusions. First, it does not appear that the colored schools entered definitely into the minds of those charged with common school education." His argument was based on physical facilities, the absence of general supervision with the contention that some teachers had not seen their superintendent in six years, and the fact that there were 275 accredited white public high schools and only two black ones. Secondly, he said, there was hostility toward Negro education, and third, the colored teachers were often selected by some influential white man in the community from among poorly prepared Negroes who had worked for him.

Effective multicultural education includes a sympathetic touch between teacher and pupil—knowledge on the part of the teacher, not simply of the individual taught but of his surroundings and background; the history of his class; and contact between teacher and pupil on the basis of perfect social equality. These details have been given because information is regarded as power; information which allows an educational institution to establish continuity with the past of its students gives it power to grapple with the educational dilemmas.

Buell Gallagher set the stage for the next issue of our problem some 35 years ago, when he said that, unless the Negro colleges are ready to abandon much that is mummery of the standardized college, they will actually have to miseducate, thwart, and misdirect youth in order to become socially effective. The nonfunctional college is not merely irrelevant; it is miseducative and parasitical. In fact, the nonfunctional college for Negroes acquiesces and day by day defeats the desires of Negroes and thereby miseducatively consents to the social stultification in which America is denied a contribution which might be made by one-tenth of its people. We dare to hope that some colleges will wish to fulfill their social function and that they will wish to become prophetic rather than monastic and servile.

Higher education will become effectively prophetic when not only its formal instruction but equally its structures and procedures are redirected by the best available group thinking. This issue of problems to me is that of the control of the institution. The persistent paternalism which is manifested through the board of control prevents the affected group from sharing in the experience of planning and implementing programs of education. Thus I am saying that, whereas they are regarded as predominantly black institutions, they are not in black control. The ability of those who are concerned and are identified with student population are not assisting the educational process, standards, values, and perspectives, even though they are in a majority in the institution. Relevancy of courses, community involvement, sensitivity to the

demands of our times are mere cliches, for they are not the features which are rewarded in our institutions. Pressures for basic conformity have been exerted, and cultural diversity has been amiss. The sit-ins and civil rights confrontations were begun by Negro college students, and subtle forms of pressure are emerging in institutions to establish atmospheres which are restricting and in some instances debilitating. We see this as evidenced by limited travel budgets, reductions in appropriations, reduced summer offerings, meager salary increases which allow the more qualified persons to be recruited by prestigious schools, publication of mediocre accomplishments of the in-crowd while ignoring the meritorious service of the out-crowds, and, most of all, demands of loyalty in preference to all other indices of productivity without recognition of this as having been the sign of advanced decay in all previous social institutions which have fallen.

Yes, I visualize the controlling elements of our institutions as looking for ways of cutting into the problem without sacrifice. They, the controlling elements, like politicians, are voting for what is popular instead of what is known to be right and needed. With these three particular issues before you, let me close by making three or four statements which I think are necessary in appraising our particular situation at the moment.

The preparation of teachers determines the rate of progress and the educational level of the people; thus if we are going to raise the level of the people, we're also going to have to raise the level of the preparation of teachers. I am thoroughly convinced that black colleges will continue in existence, if not extinguished by political fires, for years to come, for multicultural education which puts minorities at ease in majority settings is more a myth than a reality. I am thoroughly convinced that minorities need a broad exposure to vocational opportunities; they particularly need to look at what is available in business and industry before teaching as a career choice is finalized. Otherwise, they graduate in a teacher education curriculum, go into teaching for a year, and then come back saying, "Somebody rescue me because this is definitely not what I want." I am concerned about the over-expansion of curricula offerings, about sequencing, and about articulation. These need immediate attention. For example, our general psychology class omits the study of the nervous system and vision so that they can be covered by the biology department. Yet it would give us an opportunity in psychology to reach topics that we would otherwise not be able to cover. I am thoroughly convinced that articulation and sequencing have an important place in our institutions.

Differentiated staffing suggests the possibility of career levels in teaching as in nursing and the healing arts. I am sure that you cannot make a competent or all-purpose teacher out of all students, but there are levels, for example, the media specialist who might not be able to be in full command of a classroom.

These are things that I think are suggested to us. Above all, to me, it is the purpose and responsibility in our multicultural setting for predominantly black institutions to address themselves to the fact of a social order which brands individuals as inferior.

CHARLES F. LEYBA
Associate Professor of Education
California State College at Los Angeles

I would like to cast my address along two major lines. In the beginning I would like to take into consideration some of the very broad and logical aspects of making education relevant and therefore of bringing the culture of the minorities into education. Then I would like to speak of some practical advantages of doing so.

Until about 20 years ago, there existed in this country an assumption that there is a least common denominator culture. This really meant that if individuals from divergent backgrounds were to be brought to this country and exposed to our society, and especially, brought into our school system, that something like a least common denominator American would emerge. This, of course, was an assumption; it was also an abstraction, and it was, finally, an ideal. These are all the same thing.

Going deeper into our history, the founder of this university, Thomas Jefferson, assumed the least common denominator intellectual faculty, and together with it, he also assumed a kind of commonly held equal desire to succeed. These are two of the assumptions, at least, that underlie his bill for the greater diffusion of learning presented to the Virginia State Legislature. He envisioned a tiered system of schools, beginning with the elementary level, accompanied by examinations which would gradually winnow out those individuals who had not performed well. The capstone of this intellectual structure was to be this very university.

The purpose, as Thomas Jefferson envisioned this bill, was to lay the axe, once and for all, to the root of a pseudo-aristocracy built along blood lines and money. Now, 150 years later, after some research and an awful lot of suffering on the part of minorities and disadvantaged people, we have come to find out that there is no least common denominator culture, that there is no least common denominator intelligence, and that there is certainly no least common denominator equal opportunity to succeed defined in terms of middle class learning and success styles. The schools, as a buffer to blood lines and money, have, in fact, failed us.

Instead, as Patrick Moynihan implied in a statement that he made two weeks ago, family income, or simply money, is tied to a syndrome of psychological characteristics that profoundly affect school performance. In fact, this is

only secondarily true. Family income develops a life style for the individual from which he is practically incapable of being retracted once it has been cast on him.

We know something about these life styles and I repeat them here only as background. First of all, we know that family income does develop a certain ability to look at subject matter as we currently know it in a fairly undisturbed and attentive way. We secondarily know that this same factor creates an ability to have realistic ambition and to sequentially plan in terms of months and years. This same factor also creates a third quality in the learner, namely an ability to to use language in an elaborate fashion, as least as defined in terms of the number of words per utterance and in the number of subordinate clauses utilized per sentence. All of these as measures and manifestations of intelligence are tied distinctly to family income. These in turn are tied to a professionalized way of life that has grown so intricate that the newly appointed chancellor of Columbia University stated that it now takes until age 30 or 35 to prepare individuals for a truly professionalized way of life in this country, a thing, by the way, which he said the young would no longer accept. As a result, this professionalization of life has extended itself to an international race among the supernations of the world, competing in scientific and technological proficiency and leaving the poor and the minorities to lurk forever in the doorways of modern civilization. The conditions of modern intellectual competition have turned the schools into an interlocking maze of more intricate academic skills that make it too late by the sixth grade for many poor and minority students.

I would like to tell you about an incident that I witnessed when I was in Houston about five days ago. I was at the Manned Spacecraft Center, and outside there was an Apollo capsule. I saw a black man there, photographing the capsule, and it caused me to reflect two or three days afterwards on what was going on in his mind when he photographed it. Was he doing what anybody would do when he saw Niagara Falls or the pyramids? Did he for a minute ask himself: what of blackness and what of Mexican-Americanness went into this entire space effort? And if he had asked himself this question, I wondered if he would have wanted to photograph that capsule, aside from the sensation he must have had of being in the presence of one of the great scientific breakthroughs in the history of the West.

But that moment was full of poignancy for me, because I knew that there was very little of the black minority involved in this, and there was very little, in fact, nothing, of the Mexican-American minority involved in this space race. What has all this to do with multicultural education? If you listen to what the minorities are telling you, if I listen accurately to what my involved minority students are telling me as I deal with them daily, they are simply saying, let us immediately forget this business of international competition to succeed technologically and scientifically that has completely professionalized all education, beginning with the graduate schools all the way down to the elementary schools. Instead, let us now turn toward making the schools places where we can respect all individuals regardless of their backgrounds, places in which the individual can find something of himself that reflects his person and his intellectual background. The minorities are asking for the schools to establish *now* a personalistic, humane, self-realizing civilization by turning our interest

inwardly upon the spirit of America, not upon the demands of a competitive race that has been thrust upon us.

What the minorities are telling us is that we must make education relevant, here and now, and that we must make it relevant by introducing culturally based material into every phase of the undergraduate experience. To make biology relevant, it must concern itself in an interdisciplinary fashion with chemistry and physics; it must be made relevant to the needs of people living in the great urban centers, relevant to the damaging effects of drugs, relevant to pollution, relevant to genetic mutations from pesticides, relevant to the condition of life among the poor. To make social studies relevant, they must reflect the cultures of all the individuals in this country. If you must have laboratories, then let them be in full community service. What subject matter specialist would say that four hours spent working with a community relations specialist, or with a school nurse, is the equivalent of listening to a stand-up lecture in a quiet hall in a language that is frequently not very intelligible to the minorities who have come there in their attempt to learn?

The effort in bringing multicultural education into the colleges is to try to swing into the orbit of human concerns all of the subject matter that is found in the undergraduate and graduate experience. What the minorities have seen is that we have here in the United States computerized Dionesian culture, and what we are asking for is the establishment of an Apollonian democracy of the spirit that respects everyone. This demand for culturally relevant education poses, if you are a conservative, the greatest threat and the greatest attack on the traditional meaning of undergraduate education that has ever been posed to the colleges of this country. If you are of the liberal persuasion, it presents the greatest challenge that has ever been faced by undergraduate education in this country. Its only other parallel in our history was at the turn of this century, when, through the enforcement of attendance laws and through the industrialization of our economy, great numbers of students were sent to our schools to learn; it was then that the schools had to reach within their spirits to find ways and means to hold these individuals there and to make their experience in the schools meaningful. This is now the challenge facing higher education.

This modification to relevancy of all the subjects of the undergraduate experience will produce a magnificent teacher preparation program, but we must move swiftly to accomplish it. The schools of education can no longer do it by themselves, and it is cynical and hypocritical to have the letters and sciences people in effect prepare the teacher in the subject-matter realm and then point to us for failing to produce relevant teachers. To this end, I have suggested to the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development of the U. S. Office of Education that in the coming year, it select five or six excellent preparation programs around the country and augment their grants by $50,000. This is a ball park figure. The amount would be given to the school of education and subcontracted to the letters and sciences faculties, telling them that we wanted to buy three professors to prepare teachers at the undergraduate level by making their courses relevant. We would not ask them to change the catalogue description but simply to teach the course differently, because the curriculum is what happens in the schoolroom, not what happens in the catalogue. I am asking the Bureau to make these grants accountable, to require proof by the middle of

the first year that at least five courses have been rewritten and submitted to the curriculum committees and academic senates.

There are, of course, more immediate values to the introduction of cultural material into the classroom. What are culturally based materials doing at the college level now? At our college, they serve as an umbrella to shelter the minorities. We have a great number of culturally based courses already in existence—a black studies program, a Mexican-American studies program. Into these programs we flood the minority youngsters. They major in Mexican-American and black studies, because in these curricula they find teachers who will help them keep their grade-point average high. They minor in what they would like to major in, pledging that when they receive the bachelor's degree they will get a master's degree in their minor.

Second, we want to introduce culturally based materials in order to secure acceptable performance. The Educational Testing Service is developing an urban teacher test. It has already been field tested once and found that minority students taking these tests, which contain items drawn from black and Mexican-American cultures, score 10 points higher.

Third, introducing culturally based materials brings about minority student satisfaction with the school and improvement in attendance. In a school district in which we had introduced these materials families have decided not to move out of the district so that their children could benefit from the curriculum.

Finally, and probably most important, the introduction of culturally based materials, particularly at the undergraduate level, will bring new knowledge to the college and gradually turn its engines of resources on the concerns of the inner city. It will begin to transform the college into what Clark Kerr foresaw as one of the destinies of the multiversity, namely a vehicle to perform for modern urbanized America those functions that the land grant college performed for a nation that was emerging industrially and needed agricultural improvement. I find this happening at a very minor level wherever I go, but most of all in the schools of education. I am convinced that the school of education is the point at which the great breakthrough will occur in the introduction of multiculturally based materials.

The Need for Individual Commitment

THE REV. C. T. VIVIAN
President
A Black Center for Strategy and
Community Development
Chicago, Illinois

If we are to think seriously about the kinds of problems that face us, if we are to think seriously about education in relation to community change, then it must be clear that we speak of a minority community in transition; and that everything that was before is suspect, if not, in fact, antiquated; and that the guidelines for yesterday can by no means be the rules for today.

We must face some new facts. We are now involved in a revolution, a revolution that is not easily defined. But we must face the fact that it is a youth revolution, it is a black revolution, it is a revolution of the poor and the disinherited. Centrally, this revolution so far has not brought a great external change in American life, but it has created a great internal change in the psyches, in the minds, in the spirits, in the very hearts and souls of America's poor and young and black.

We must face some other facts. Almost no one is properly educated for the 20th century, regardless of whether he is poor or black. And there isn't an institution in this culture that is not racist almost by definition. We must face the other fact that our greatest wasted resource is the talent of minority youth, who often find themselves in jail. How many more Malcolms and Cleavers do we need—the burning firebrands who tell us that behind the fire is great imagination, insight, brilliance, genius, and ability to define and to cope with the culture? At the time that white youth go to college, black youth go to jail. As we look at that, we must understand as well that we are part of a culture that has never really solved any human problems. Physical problems, yes. Human problems, no. Our frontiers have been places to which we could run to escape. Now there are no more frontiers to which we can run. Yet we are faced, in spite of ourselves, with dealing with some basic human problems. There is growing pressure on us who consider ourselves the thinkers and decision-makers because the poor, the disinherited, the black, the brown, and the red are tired of dealing with symptoms and they can no longer be fooled. And since they are tired, they are now coming to the causal base of the problem. They are beginning to directly confront us—the school boards, the college administrators, and the nation's policy-makers.

Another strange kind of fact is that black youth, our black disinherited youth, have become the leaders of white youth. We can no longer define

"nigger" in terms of color and colorlessness; we must now define "nigger" in terms of power and powerlessness. The very base for social change in the culture somehow comes out of that great black moving mass of discontent, which, though axed out in frustration, is giving insight into the true problems of the culture. Those who follow are not necessarily a minority but a part of the youth culture; as we see this strange kind of thing happening, we do not truly see the coming together of those forces as much as an imitation and a separation, so that the old integration that we can depend upon is dead.

It is not dead because black people killed it out of anger. Our anger has come because white people have killed it. Integration was not destroyed at the will of black people but at the deep desire, almost the sickness, in the American psyche of white people. But far more important for our youth is that the old coalition of white liberal and black leaders is no longer a working social construction. For now we must realize that it never really had meaning because the decisions were being made by white liberals, and the black leader played a secondary role in quieting people down. The white liberals went through the powers that be, and said, "Give to these people, who have such great need, something out of your pockets," and the great powers looked over the side and dropped little goodies down. The white liberals ran back to the black leaders and said, "See, we have produced." The black leaders then ran to the black masses and said, "Cool it. Can't you see there is going to be a better tomorrow? Things are going to be better. There is something you could have." But the black masses are no longer accepting the construction of those leaders picked by liberals, for they always knew that it did not satisfy their needs.

We are involved in a social drama. We are involved in social engineering. We are looking at a new power, a new force, and attempting to find the means of dealing with it realistically as it rolls around upon the surface of American life. There is an important word in the black community, and if we are not cognizant of this word and what it means to minority Americans, we will not be able to develop a curriculum. We will not be able to think realistically about the black man, the brown man, or the red man of the seventies. The word that seems to stand out above the other words is "independence." Regardless of which of the basic institutions of the black culture we look at, whether the Black Muslims or the Panthers or SCLC or SNCC or CORE or NAACP,* there is one word that stands out that is basic to all of black life: "independence." We will be independent of white racist domination.

This would not be so difficult to accept, and, in fact, to deal with, if there were not another cry, an unheard word, from the white side of the spectrum. As we look across all the organizations that represent decision-making for white culture—big business, big government, big church—there is a word that is unheard, unspoken, and yet is the basis upon which policy is actually created for minority people. That word is "charity." "We will give you charity!" Black, brown, and red people say, "We will be independent!" That is the clash, between the drive for minority independence and the desire for the white majority to deal out of a charity relationship.

---

*Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Congress of Racial Equality, and National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

We are to be serious about how we program. We are to set ourselves to actually solving our problems. Let me suggest five basic words upon which we can hang some of our concepts, do some of our planning and thinking, project curriculum, redesign institutions, and create our relationships with one another.

What I hear coming from white suburban America is something like this: "Is that all black people want to do? Burn down the cities and, shut in the midst of it all, control the action?" And what I hear coming from black young people who are supposed to be the burners is quite another thing. I hear them saying: "We will burn if necessary in order to control our lives," but burning is not even important to them as it is to the suburbs. The important word to them is "control." We will control our lives. Let us look at that, for around that word we can begin to see ourselves and to do some planning. What is being said is that we will control the institutions on black terms. We will control them because other people's control of them has been a failure. We will control them because white America is too sick to be in control of black life. We will control them because white America does not have the respect for black life to deal with it in the present or the future, and the past has proven this. What is being said is that we will control the processes, because there is no problem that stands by itself, that will not overlap. If we cannot control housing, we cannot control the schools; and if we cannot control jobs, we cannot control housing. We must control the processes because there was a process called urban renewal that was meant to be the means whereby black and poor Americans would be able to have a better way of life; but under the control of white people it became not renewal but removal.

It has become clear that there must be black control of every program that is placed on black soil. Those programs that deal with black life must be initiated by black people. We must have a new relationship that says there can be technical assistance, but the final decisions must be made by those who live there, by those who are a part of that life, by those who have to put their children into these programs. For these programs ultimately determine much that is essential to the life and health of any people and of any community. We must be able to set the priorities and to control them. This is basic to understanding the new black man, the new minority man. The priorities for the colonized are always different from the priorities of the colonizer.

Control means a black man in transition who is at the helm of social change and is awake to the essential understanding among education, nationhood, and people fulfillment. When we speak in terms of such control, we see that black man come out of a whole new context with the understanding that today he must go from dependence to independence in order to create the new society. We must deal, then, with the second word, "unity." For we begin to see the goal of the black community: desire to create a new independent minority community that begins to define not only for itself, but for all America, what it means to be human in the 20th century.

A grand hope! A true vision! This is something beyond the kind of vision that we speak of in the so-called hallowed halls of education. It is the kind of understanding that is difficult for us to cope with when it comes, not out of the affluent society, but out of that suffering community that desires with its very nervous system something better than what all of America's affluence has been

able to create. A sense of unity, if you will. We must understand what we have to do for it, what it demands of us, and whether we ought to deal with it or not. This new drive for minority unity calls for us to begin to take our minds off individualism—rugged or otherwise—and begin to reconstruct our thinking. You and I came out of an age that was by and large trying to make it. We were concerned about individual comfort and a dollar, even though we talked about dignity. We were concerned about our individual thrust. Now we are dealing with a society that has seen us fail, is concerned not so much with what happens to each as an individual but what happens to all as a group.

This is the cry for basic change in the curriculum of American education, particularly as it deals with minorities. We hear that cry coming from the most intelligent and prolific of whites as well, in both the colleges and the high schools. For there is a new sense of why a man works, what he works for, and what are the ends of his endeavor. It is difficult for us, who strove so hard to make it, to even begin to understand; and it is at this point that we probably need our greatest sensitivity training session rather than simply the wearing of black and white masks. We need something deeper—in the way we do business, in the basic assumptions that have been so much a part of our lives for so many years that it is difficult for us to understand this basic difference. We are now dealing with a new young man who is concerned about remaking society so that it is fit to live in for everyone. The problem is, are we ready to do it with him? Are we so much a part of the past that he will have to leave us behind? One young college student put it: "How can they win when they don't even know the name of the game?"

Let's look at it. There is the drive for black unity because it is clear in every sphere, particularly in the sphere of education, that the true needs of the impoverished community cannot be met with individualism. The true needs of the poverty community, in a time when full employment is a myth, means that that community must be united in order to solve its basic problems. For example, in most of our large cities, the unions are not concerned about the black teacher. They do not program him in deliberations at the tables where wages are set and conditions are met. The black teacher works under a school board that is racist by definition. He cannot deal with the problems of education by himself, nor can he depend upon either the board or the union; so he must, in union with the community, solve those problems of unequal certification procedures, of substandard institutional conditions, of nonrelevant administration, of internal and racist guidelines for him and his school, complacent teachers, both black and white, who have been defeated by the social blocks placed in their paths. Only the unity of the black community can deal with these problems. The black teacher has no other place to go. That unity is central to creating the new community. The power of that community is dependent upon the control that it has. Unity will decide the level of its educational life, for unity remakes the condition. It is the black school that must provide the thinkers; it is the black school that must provide the strategy for the black community to remake itself. For we are not dealing with a black problem. There is no such thing as a black problem in America. There is a white problem of white racism, and a black condition has been created by that problem.

It becomes a socio-political-economic force that is a base upon which the

black community can find itself, a base upon which it can create power and from which it can share power in the larger community. Unity is basic. I am talking about a new kind of unity, in which teachers can be heard, parents can be respected, and students can give their input.

We must understand that a new unity of the black community is necessary so that we can create a drive in it that will be the liberating force, for there is no force from the outside. It must come up out of the people themselves. And we must be humble enough to realize that the ultimate curriculum for the new emerging community will be designed with the nitty-gritty folk who live there and whose drive for freedom and liberation is the basis of the most important curriculum planning today.

There are those who ask, "Why community involvement? Don't we professionals really have the word?" Basically, the idea of involvement has always been a working reality for the white community. It produced free schools at a time when there was a need for free schools. It provided for a racist society regardless of the Constitution and all of the fourth of July speeches. It was the community involvement of the white society that provided vocational education for a new industrial civilization, provided liberal arts for a more affluent society, and now has set scientific goals for a new technological, automated society. We have seen it work for white people, and we know it must work for us. Such united involvement in the community is the only real way to create people power, and if you and I, in our educational strivings, are not really concerned about building new people, then we have no business teaching anyone.

Involvement in policy-making remakes the character of people. People dealing with their needs in an institutionalized form that can help them work and spell out their future is the basis upon which hope is built. People must be involved in the community because it psychologically reinforces their minds, their wills, and their self-images. A revolution within is needed for blacks, and basic to that is involvement in the re-creation of the community, in every institution, in setting of standards, in dealing realistically with decision-making.

What black communities need more than any other thing right now is probably a cultural revolution. It's needed to liberate the minds of black communities that have so long been told what we were told as kids: "If you're white you're right; if you're brown hang around; if you're black get back." But that didn't take the edge off the deep psychological scar or the heavy burden of people going around thinking that they were nothing because their history books told them so. Only those who live in the midst of that minority community have the answer. Those outside of it are too racist, too paternalistic, except in rare instances. They are incapable of doing anything other than taking orders in a black situation and asking whether their input has meaning, instead of demanding that we use what they come up with.

The next key word is "radical." It is probably a fact that there is not a problem that we could not solve if we had the will to solve it, but in order to solve the basic problem of American life today, we must be radical. Whether we have the will to be radical is going to decide what kind of education we have in the seventies. How thankful I was to hear coming from Washington the other day the direct statement that American education as we know it must be scrapped. It wasn't put quite that forcefully, but that's what was being said, that we must be

radical enough to start teaching children at the age of 2½, and we must build into the curriculum every way of dealing realistically with the truth that American education as we know it has failed.

In most cities, something like 45 to 50 percent of the population is black. And it is admitted by each school board in this nation that they are failing to educate minorities. If there were a hospital in any city that sent 50 percent of its patients to the cemetery, we would get rid of that hospital tomorrow. If we were dealing with the mechanic who somehow flunked 50 percent of his job and left the cars on the highway, we would get rid of that mechanic tomorrow. But when it comes to education, we can miseducate 50 percent of our society (a conservative figure) and feel as though there is no need to be radical. Yet, if there is one thing that we are called to in this society today, as those who are concerned about education, it is to produce rebels, to produce young men and women who are willing to rebel against this society, to produce such rebellion in young people that they are willing to change what we have made of the American dream into that forgotten past that was yesterday's at least abstract heritage. We must be radical enough to deal with the fact that what we call quality education is a myth for most of the people in our schools. It has been a white middle class, hand-me-down, not made to fit nor to serve those for whom it was not planned. We must be radical enough to not even spend our time on educational programs that do not deal with alienation of youth, that do not deal with the primary issues of this society. We must not waste our time with curriculum that does not deal with the basic sickness of this society, racism. This calls for a new radical approach to what we're about so that we can prepare teachers who can deal with their own inner problems, the deep psychotic problems that are there because of the culture of which we are a part. They who become the cures of themselves can begin to deal with youth who are badly in need of such mature leadership. For when we begin to think of minority youth, we have to realize that they live in a jungle and that every day they are faced with survival as the basic issue of life. We cannot waste our time with less than radical new approaches and programs.

What we are asking for is a new basis for acceptance. I see youth, whether burning down banks in California, or simply wearing their long hair, or following the so-called new sexuality, demanding a new basis of acceptance in this culture, acceptance for what they are. They are saying, "We do not have to be remade in your image, for you have proved to be less than God. But you must accept us and create whole new patterns of acceptance." That is a radical concept. Our young people are saying, "Can you deal with our loneliness and not reject us? Can you be involved in our search for new life patterns, new bases for acceptance?"

Black young people take it a step further. They are saying, "We are concerned about new mobility processes." My daughter goes to a school that a few years ago was largely Italian, a few years after that was largely Jewish, and now is becoming rapidly black. As I sat in that school recently during a graduation exercise, I saw the stern faces of the black mothers, and my mind was called back to a different ceremony in the same kind of school, where the Italian mothers, when their kids came across the stage, were weeping. I have been told that it happens in most of the minority communities, for what they know is

that when their child gets that high school diploma, it is their escape from the minority ghetto. They can then go up and out into the larger society and be a part of it. Every black mother who sat in that room knew that it did not matter whether her child got his high school diploma or not, even whether he went on to college or not. There would still be a 90 percent risk that there would not be any mobility in his condition and he would be caught in the recurring cycle of poverty. New mobility processes – that is a demand of the period.

Let me deal with the last word, "identity," a word that until black people started moving, was almost forgotten in the sense that black people see it today. Many people seeing that word think of it and speak of it in terms of black pride, a James Brown concept. Well, it was that song that permeated society and gave us something upon which to move, but beyond that, there was something far more profound. For the word "soul" is more than soul food and soul music; there is something profound about soul that is in conflict with every basic concept of white society.

Let's look at it another way. By and large we live in a "thing" culture. We live in a culture that is so concerned about things that it turns people into things. It is able to produce on such a scale, but "how much?" and "how many?" become two of the most important questions we ask in this society. Yet here is a black society, getting to deal, not out of things, but out of a sense of soul, of personhood, of being, of individual fulfillment in terms of the whole group. This sense of allowing a man to be creative, not to be standardized, is in conflict with the culture that says our education is supposed to make all of us really alike. How nonsensical! Can we take kids out of the ghettos of our land and take kids from the suburbs and then bring them together in an educational process to turn them out alike? Impossible! The conflict is between that sense of soul which is the basic sense of humanists and the understanding of thingness; conflict between a sense of what it means to be human on the one hand and what it means to suppress one's humanism on the other; what it means to be concerned about dignity over dollars; what it means to be concerned about one's manhood over money. This new sense of identity is based upon something so profound that it breaks the old wineskin and calls for whole new ways of movement. It calls for us somehow to understand that we basically live in a nonhuman culture, a culture that really does not know what it means to produce in the fuller sense of that word. We have a good number of dropouts and push-outs because, they tell us, school is not where it's happening. They say, "Let's get out of here so we can live," instead of, "Let us be living while we are here." A new sense of identity can then spell out the bases of reform and revolution for our educational life.

The creation of something badly needed in this culture can come out of the programming of minority education. What we need are guidelines for the creation of the new urban man. It is my contention that black youth, in the ghettos, in the sufferings, in the nitty-gritty of the inner cities, who have no false bases upon which to move, will become our prototype for the new urban man. Much of white society is still tied to an agricultural past, coming into the city and longing for the farm land. They mow their lawns meticulously in a sort of psychological yearning for yesterday's farm. It is not here any more, and the values and the way of life that went with it are not here any more. We have a new set

of conditions, but we do not have a new man or the guidelines for that new man.

But out of new black life, out of that nitty-gritty condition, can come the prototype for the saving of a society that must face its urban world and for which there is no longer a frontier to which to run. What we consider today's disadvantaged child may be the basis of the truly advantaged for the coming decade.

When I read some of the letters that white children from the suburbs, who have gone off to urban colleges, write back to their parents, saying, "Why didn't you tell me this is what life is really like? I don't care if I ever come back home or not, because you try to make me in your image, which was yesterday's generation. The life you live isn't worth living because it didn't prepare me for life," then I know that what we call the disadvantaged may be advantaged and what we call advantaged may be the disadvantaged.

I begin to see the reality of the urban life which we live. It is hard for us, out of our middle class orientation, in our middle class mentalities, to set the standards whereby the decade will move. It must come up out of the action. And as I look at this assembly, I realize that almost none of the black colleges are present which prepare the teachers who will go into the inner city schools, who will be setting guidelines that may be the true guidelines for the seventies and eighties for the revolution in education and in society. I realize the need for this powerful organization to work together with these colleges and universities and to see that they have the money they need, which they do not have the power to pull but which you can extract for them.

We do not work on a task that is black or white. We work on the new American task, and we who are black fight for a new community to try to define what it means to be human in the 20th century. We do not do it for ourselves, but we do it for all Americans. Strangely enough, you and I, who have our champagne moments and our hours of celebration but who by and large spend very normal, staid, grey existences; you and I, who wear leather shoes, and eat mashed potatoes, and watch TV, may have within us the power to remake the coming generation and fit this nation for a century it was never ready to enter, and did not want to admit had arrived. For you and I have far more power than we know, and that power can reshape a nation and make us worthy of the founding fathers.

Preparation for Campus Change

JOHN E. KING
Past President, AACTE
Professor of Higher Education
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

The past 10 years in higher education have seen budgets and enrollments double, and, in some cases, triple in publicly supported institutions. Many pressures have developed, especially during these last five years. Events during the 1969-70 school year involving disruptions and violence, including arson and bombing, have caused that particular year to be considered the year of greatest student unrest in the history of U. S. higher education. Students at more than 400 colleges went on strike, usually peacefully. At least 200 institutions were shut down at some point. Several, including my own, remained closed for a period of as long as 30 days.

It is no longer good clean fun to talk about ferment in colleges. There is a stark reality about this now, a foreboding about this fall, that I think touches us all. As we think of the 1970-71 academic year, we wonder what it is going to be like. What changes are coming? I am going to present some ideas to you in three parts. First, I am going to try to get at some of the overall causes of disruptions. Then I am going to suggest some of the things that several of the institutions throughout the country are considering or attempting to do. And finally, I am going to suggest a few things that I believe are most valuable to us right now. These may bear most on us, who are interested in teacher education.

There may be as many as eight million students and 2,500 two- and four-year colleges and universities in the United States this fall. The operating budgets of these institutions may total as much as $20 billion from taxes and private sources. Parents, workers, wives, and other individual supporters will contribute perhaps $15 billion more to pay for tuition, room and board, clothing, and other things. The economy of this nation may suffer by as much as $10 billion more because job productivity not engaged in by most of these students. We are talking, then, of as much as $40 or $45 billion a year that we are investing in society as a society to make education possible for eight million students in institutions. The enrollments within these higher education institutions will account for four percent of our population, even at a time when we have more than three million men in the armed services and will be engaged in overseas conflict at a major cost in men and funds.

There are interesting things about this analysis of the higher education population that you should be quite concerned about. Even though four

percent of our population is in college now, only about 1.7 percent of the black population and perhaps less than one percent of the Indian population is in college. It seems to me these figures show something, especially in view of the point I am going to make: apparently, we are passing over a cultural watershed in this country; higher education in a two- or four-year college has become a common school for the people of the United States. Ladies and gentlemen, this may be a primary cause of disruption on our campuses. This may be a greater cause of disruption, fundamentally, than the revolutionaries and radicals on our campuses. It may be a greater cause of revolution and difficulties than our poor management, ofttimes freely admitted. And it is certainly a greater cause of disruption than parental permissiveness or many other things on which we tend, in an adversary-centered society, to place the blame.

This cultural watershed has some concomitants. We are moving away from Malthusian-Darwinian concepts as far as motivation of students is concerned. We are moving away from the idea of social mobility. The idea that by the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread or the idea that you go to school to move as high as possible in our socio-economic strata is practically thrown out by a great many young people.

State figures will bear out the notion of the common school for the American people, and they will reveal the rapidity of change within the last two years. The efforts of parents, legislators, and private donors to make all this possible is to me one of the most beautiful and almost tragic things that has happened to a people. In one state, more than 30 percent of the operating budget has been going into higher education for the last 10 years. The belief that higher education will result in a better way of life is still widely held by the noncollege parents of our young people. As you know, it is now a source of suffering and humiliation not to graduate from high school. It may be that as much as 90 percent of our population has graduated from high school. And the social pressure is very heavy on high school graduates to go to college. This pressure is coming not just from parents or college coaches. It comes from the grass roots of our culture.

A few years ago, if you went to college you were upper 25 percent or at least upper half. Now, if you don't go, you are bottom 25 percent and you are being discriminated against. It is far worse in a country, culturally, to have 75 percent of the population going to college and 25 percent unable to go or unacceptable. The 25 percent are in worse trouble and will cause more problems than would a population with 75 percent unable to attend college. You can't discriminate against 75 percent of the population. You can discriminate against 25 percent. There is a lack of alternative opportunities for young people. There isn't much left, in this technical society of ours, for them to do after graduation from high school except to go to college. Few jobs with dignity are available to the young person who decides not to go to college, and few opportunities for marriage are available to the girl who does not go to college. Furthermore, most high school graduates are qualified only to go to college. We have a system which does not prepare them to enter jobs with any dignity, and they have not had work experience of any consequence.

The large college enrollments during the last few years is due, then, to the absence of opportunities, the social pressure to go to college because it is the

thing to do, and to the efforts and generosities of mostly noncollege parents. In light of these factors and others, such as the war in Vietnam, it is small wonder to me that we have had as much difficulty on college campuses as we have had. What, then, can we do to make it possible for us to operate? When I study the figures and the situation, several generalizations come to mind.

One is that the nature of the students, the nature of the faculty, and the nature of the cultural situation in which different institutions find themselves have a lot to do with the prospects for disruptions and difficulties this fall. There are hundreds of institutions in this country of 20,000 or more in size, many of them dealing with a percentage of urban students and organized with large arts colleges at the center. These institutions will have much more trouble than smaller institutions, especially smaller institutions south of the Mason-Dixon line and those that are in less heavily populated areas. But all of these institutions have certain categories of students, and I want to roughly categorize those who cause difficulty. I am going to characterize what I believe is the present situation, which will continue at least until 1975.

I believe that there are as many as 50,000 or as few as 25,000 real radicals, confirmed revolutionaries, who are hanging around and on campuses in this country, and obviously they will stay closer to the "in" campuses, the campuses where there is action—Berkeley, Harvard, Michigan, and such institutions. Some of them are not students, some are. By calling them radicals or revolutionaries, I mean the following. We have a system in this country which very few of us understand, the system of a free society and our constitution and the rights of people. Around the world and here this system is recognized as being fragile, good, difficult to maintain, imperfect, and the best possible system under which mankind can live. Since the beginning of human culture, I believe no system has been developed which could work better for more people than ours. There are perhaps 25,000 or 50,000 people, some of them professors, some students, who don't believe this.

I thought at first that some of them believed merely in a change of "who's" at the top or a change in participation. Obviously, we need to have so many more things working better, so many less walking wounded, so many fewer losers in our type of system. But to destroy this system, or to change it completely to a totalitarian or another completely different kind of system, is unthinkable to most of us. The interesting thing is that there have been such people in our culture for a long time, and I don't think that the war in Vietnam has greatly increased their numbers. It is just that this is a wonderful time for these people to do a great many things. They can affect a second group, who may number as many as two million. These are youngsters who are in college, not distributed too widely throughout teacher education programs but occurring in some numbers in almost all colleges. They are described by the following statement:

"The greatest problem on the modern campus is student uncertainty and skepticism about the university's place in society. Students repudiate much of what they see in society, and in the university as that part of society which contributes in important ways to shaping society in forms which evoke neither respect nor affection." These are youngsters who, almost from the time that they arrive at the university, have been snake-bit. They have a shortage of

experience in the culture. They haven't contributed to it. They feel guilty not just because they haven't been drafted but because they do not feel a part of the culture.

Some people use the term alientated. In my judgment, this is largely a matter of ontology; I believe their reality is not lifelike, and I think this is because of the moving away from an agrarian society, the lack of work experience, and the lack of true membership in the home, which has made the youngster a visitor in his home. He is there because his parents have loved him, but he has not been used or needed. He is unable to contribute to the culture. He goes to college in this stream of going because he's there, but in some cases he is as amoral as a jack rabbit. He hasn't been to Sunday school or church, and oftentimes he is quite bright. It is fantastically impractical to assume that you can locate such youngsters and get rid of them. They exist everywhere, but they exist in great concentration in certain institutions and in certain departments. These youngsters would have been helped tremendously by more work experience, by being needed, by having some kind of role before 18 years of age that would have placed the burden of being useful on them. No other culture apparently has ever been able to produce such a high percentage of them. They are good youngsters, and they have enormous potential. There are so many things that can happen to them. But they are sitting ducks for these 25,000 to 50,000 revolutionaries who can put up, in many cases, a glamorous in-group situation in which to participate.

Now I mentioned the hazard of about two million of such students. That may be high or low, but we will say 25 percent of the students. The campuses where they occur in the greatest clusters are the campuses that have the greatest volatility; and this volatility, of course, is related, sometimes geometrically, to administrative practices on these campuses and to other factors. There are perhaps another 25 percent, another two million, who lean toward liberal colleges and who empathize with revolutionaries and others, but who have great inner stability. Then there are as many as 50 percent of our student population, and I am not lumping them together in categories, who have almost a total maturity in terms of their stability. There are combinations among these that are not too unlike combinations that make certain kinds of dynamite, which can cause so much fury in so short a time.

It is likely that the supply of the first 25 percent that I have mentioned will continue and even increase through 1975. I don't believe that on our campuses there will be less volatility, or less difficulty, or fewer problems to solve. And I don't think that the bringing of such youngsters to motivational hell with their ontology will occur through many of the routine measures, currently being considered or employed, which I am going to enumerate. I think it is going to take some very serious changes in our culture, and I think it will take three to five years for these to become apparent and to be worked on. But the disruptions and problems of these past years are causing many efforts to bring about desirable changes. I want to list some of them.

Many measures are being taken to preserve order and to improve morale, such as development of government structures to include faculty, students, alumni, and community members. Another popular measure is the passage of laws and statutes in legislatures to rescind financial support from or to impose

penalties on disrupters. Perhaps 20 legislatures have done this. Actions are being taken to strengthen the hands of presidents and other officials in dealing with students and faculty in matters involving disruptions. There is quite a bit of interest in the development in states of special staffs and procedures by community and state police.

Much discussion of decentralizing university campuses and systems is under way. Quite often, this represents planning which has been developed through the years, and crisis of this kind gives it an excellent chance of being adopted. The establishment of ombudsmen is a big thing now. The study of general education programs on multipurpose campuses, it is hoped, will help establish reality, or relevance, for the student. The formation of departments and colleges are considered to have more relevancy – a college of human affairs, a school of ecology, and so forth. The development of community councils is aimed at bringing town and gown together. Publishing of students' legal responsibilities and obligations, enlarging boards of trustees, development of referendum systems, and freeing of students to work in the November elections are thought by some faculty members to be almost a sure-fire way of avoiding trouble.

Some other measures are: placement of professionally ranking faculty in all undergraduate classes; development of student-faculty-administration commissions to study major questions facing the university; research on the prediction and control of student radical behavior; tightening up on entrance requirements to get rid of troublemakers; insistence on getting rid of the troublemakers as soon as they make trouble; establishment of crisis management committees and staff; provision of more legal staff for students, faculty, and administration; provision of primary group membership for students from the time they enter until the time they leave; study of institutions that appear to have less trouble to see what factors are present or absent; stronger efforts to recruit and support blacks and other minority group students; efforts to recruit black and other minority faculty, including women; study of grading methods with greater emphasis on pass-fail grading; and development of more work opportunities for both high school and college students.

Now I am going to run over what I think are five or six of the most promising suggestions. I have said that we have a cultural situation that has developed because of a number of factors, and that we actually have within our school population perhaps as many as two million students who require special help. The kind of help that I think they require most is the work experience, an opportunity to participate in something really worthwhile, that they believe in, that would contribute to the welfare of human beings, plants, or animals. I think this is the missing element which many of these youngsters have not had. You may hear, in the next few years, of some of our leader institutions, particularly private ones, requiring as much as two years of work and military experience from youngsters before they enter the university. I don't know how this will work out, but here are suggestions that have come in to me from students, faculty members, and others which I believe are worth calling to your attention:

• The use of mature faculty members, who have led full and rich lives, to teach freshmen and sophomore courses now taught by teaching assistants. I

wouldn't be surprised to see very few teaching assistants, as we knew them during the sixties, teaching undergraduate courses by 1975.

• The development of work programs on and off campus for college and precollege students. These should deal with improvement of the environment and with helping human beings, plants, and animals.

• The decentralization of university administration. This almost sounds like a paradox: on the one hand, we are going to take the authority away from the dean and the president and place it in the hands of people; on the other hand, we are going to expect the president and dean to be responsible for what happens. But in general, I would say that colleges of education particularly are going to be more decentralized in the next three to five years.

• The development of referendum equipment and facilities. One reason referendum equipment will be developed will be to show that a large percentage of our students is getting along just fine and has very solid, mature, culturally significant positions on major questions. Many administrators will develop referendum equipment in order to give these students the chance to be heard, so that judgments will not be made just by participation of smaller segments of the population.

• Placement in the hands of all members of the university community, including faculty, copies of state and federal laws concerning violence. If you have not been in a sheriff's office recently, please go and look on the wall, and you will see hundreds of pictures of youngsters who could be yours or mine who are now wanted for federal charges—carrying explosives across state lines, inciting riots, and so forth. They are just kids. They are not the confirmed revolutionaries; they are the pigeons who were used by the revolutionaries. Planning for protests and rallies through the university, making it possible for students to express themselves, is very important.

• Finally, the study of the political roles of faculty and students and of the universities and colleges themselves. This is a most difficult one for administrators.

A Forum on the National Institute of Education

ROGER E. LEVIEN
Director
Planning Study for the National
Institute of Education
Washington, D. C.

I want to convey to you something of the character of the National Institute of Education (NIE) as it's currently conceived, and something of the process that we've been following trying to improve the conception. Then I would like to ask you some questions. I'd like to find out what you, from your perspective as producers and trainers of teachers, feel the National Institute of Education should do. Finally, I want to solicit your continued attention to this problem and your continued participation in the evolution of the Institute.

I think it's particularly fortunate that I have the chance to talk to you since I think we are both very much in the same business. For the moment, I can speak as a representative of educational research and development and you as representatives of teacher education; our jobs are identical with perhaps a slight difference in time frame. I see you as being interested in preparing the teacher to do the best job with what is now known about education and knowledge, and us in educational research and development as building the tools to new ideas, to new methods, which you will eventually pass on to the teachers. Both of us are very much concerned with that teacher, the person at the cutting edge of education, the person who is facing the action.

Now let me give you some history. In March of this year the President presented a message on education reform. The major feature of that message called for the establishment of a National Institute of Education to serve as a focus of educational research and experimentation in the United States. He foresaw this as an operation eventually achieving a very large size, perhaps 250 to 300 to maybe even 500 million dollars worth of expenditures per year at some unspecified time in the future, concerning itself with problems like improving the education of the disadvantaged, developing new methods for achieving accountability in the schools, running a series of experimental schools, helping in achieving the right to read for all students, and improving our understanding of instructional technology. These were just examples of the kinds of activities which the National Institute of Education might undertake. The President viewed it not as a device for educational research, in the narrower and older sense of the term, but rather as a mechanism for educational reform and innovation in the widest sense—a place which would inspire and encourage disciplined inquiry and intelligent problem-solving for education. At the time of the

message, a bill was presented to Congress, a bill which is still being considered, with the following basic features.

The first feature is that this operation would be separate from the Office of Education (OE). To refresh your memory, at present there is within the Office of Education the National Center for Educational Research and Development. Some of you may know it better under its old title, the Bureau of Research. This Center supports about 100 million dollars of educational research each year. The idea of the National Institute of Education is to take that responsibility and authority and move it into a separate agency, parallel in structure to the Office of Education, with a director whose position in the federal hierarchy would be equivalent to that of the commissioner of education. So a first and major feature of this initiative is the raising of the stature and visibility, and therefore the importance, of educational research and development. The second feature is the fact that the director would be equivalent to the commissioner.

The third feature is that this agency would have the authority to conduct intramural research. Currently, the National Center for Educational Research and Development sponsors research in many agencies—universities, industry, regional labs, and so forth. But it does not conduct any research and development itself. The National Institute of Education, on the other hand, would be authorized to conduct research intramurally on the model of the National Institutes of Health, which occupy a similar position in Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and conduct a considerable amount of intramural research.

While I'm on this point, let me contrast the position of health research and development in the federal government with the position of educational research and development. If we take the amount of money spent throughout the United States on health care and on education each year, we find figures which are roughly similar. There are about 60 to 65 billion dollars a year in each of these enterprises. The amount spent on research in health is about two billion dollars. The amount of money spent on educational research is about 200 million dollars, 10 percent of the amount spent on health research. The National Institutes of Health (NIH), the federal government's mechanism for supporting innovation in health care, spend a billion-and-a-half dollars each year. The National Center for Educational Research and Development spends about 100 million dollars, 10 percent. Ten percent of what the National Institutes of Health spend is spent intramurally on their campus in Bethesda, so they have about 100 million dollars worth of intramural research going on in health care. There is no intramural research, no large facility devoted to educational research and development in the United States now, and the intention of the National Institute of Education bill is to authorize the conduct of such research intramurally.

The fourth feature of the Institute would be its ability to hire people outside of the Civil Service, that is, to employ scientists and professionals without the limitations of tenure, continuity, and so on, which are part of the Civil Service system. It is hoped that the Institute would have a flux of people through it—coming in to spend a year or two on sabbatical, going out to the teachers colleges, to the universities, to industry, to regional labs—spending most of the rest of their time there. So this could become a lively and exciting and interlinking point in the educational research and development system.

The final feature, an important one for those of you who have dealt with

educational research and development establishments, would be the ability of the NIE to retain funds beyond a single fiscal year until they are expended. This means it could establish continuity and a long-term funding base under a number of programs which take far more than a single year. So the hope is to provide an Institute with some stability, continuity, intelligence, and perseverance in its goals.

Well, that's about as much as was known about the National Institute of Education in March and early April. At that time I was asked to undertake a planning study to last about six months, which means I'm supposed to have a report in October. The purpose of this planning study is to put some flesh on the bones of that idea. What, indeed, would the National Institute of Education look like, or what might it look like? I view my audience particularly as Secretary Richardson and the director of the NIE, whomever he may be. We are providing a staff paper for him, and in this six-month period I've been attempting to talk to as many audiences like this one as I can to solicit the opinions, the ideas, and the experiences which might help us to make this Insitute an effective mechanism for educational innovation. We're going to do as much of the homework as we can before we get it started, to try to avoid many of those errors that seem to creep into such activities.

I am going to identify a number of areas of questions we feel are important; when I finish my exposition, I hope that we can have a dialogue, that you can ask me some questions and I can ask you some questions.

First, what should be the objectives of the NIE? There is a vague feeling that the objectives are to improve American education. But beyond that there are more specific objectives that we might identify. Second, what would comprise a program of research and development for such an Institute? What kinds of activities should go on at the Institute? And how should this program be developed and refined and continually improved?

Third, how is an Institute like this organized? Many people are impatient with the question of organization. In fact, we've heard many individuals say, "We'll just get good people there, and the organization will take care of itself." I am skeptical about that view. An appropriate and comfortable environment is one way of making sure you get high quality people, but giving it the proper kind of structure will also ensure that they can work together and contribute. So we felt that organization was an important question. Should there be one Institute or many? How should they be structured internally? Should the funding of extramural research be separate from intramural? How do you get staff there? How do you decide what programs to undertake? All of these questions have to do with designing a mechanism, an institution, to conduct research and development and sponsor them.

The fourth question is, how can the Institute relate to the other parts of the educational system? And here, of course, one recognizes the dramatic difference between education and the other fields of research and development in this country. There are about 30,000 local school districts, 2,500 institutions of higher education, and 50 state agencies, all decentralized, highly individual, and choosing to make decisions as they wish. So the community with which the NIE is going to have to deal is very large and diffuse. What can be the appropriate linkages so that the NIE can respond to the problems which these parts

of the community identify?

The educational research and development community is similarly diffuse and in many ways incomplete. Out there are the colleges and universities, the schools of education in particular, eight research and development centers, 15 regional laboratories, and a couple of policy research centers. There are vast gaps in this system for getting from the problems of education to solutions and back again. If we had tried to conduct our industrial research with a system like that at the turn of the century, the major components would have been the physics departments of universities. We are missing pieces like research and development capabilities in the states or in certain local districts. We are missing a fairly well developed continuity at the industrial level. So the NIE is going to have to be concerned with linking itself into the operating community and building up the research and development community itself.

There is also the community that you represent, the community which produces, trains, retrains, and improves our educational system. How does the NIE link closely into the process of teacher education? If you don't know what's going on at NIE, if you don't constantly keep up to date with the latest understandings of the educational process, and if the NIE doesn't know what problems you're facing to help you respond to the needs of your clientele, then I think the entire enterprise will be far less effective than it has to be. So part of our concern is, how do we link the NIE with these various communities and make sure it's an effective contributor?

Our final concern is, how do we get an NIE started? How do we go from zero to some effective, reasonably well understood operation in a climate in which Congress is going to be watching very carefully, in which the problems of education are likely to get worse rather than better, and in which the knowledge base on which we have to build is considerably limited. Perhaps the most common piece of advice we've had—and it's a good one—is that the NIE ought to find some educational innovation that has just about to come to fruition, is just about to reach implementation, and is likely to be effective; put the final $10,000 worth of funding into the development of that innovation; and then paint NIE all over the side and parade it before the Congress. If any of you have any nominees I'd be more than happy to hear them, but we have not yet heard of such ideas. I'm afraid that much more basic, hard, and extended work in educational research and development is needed before we have the dramatic payoffs that a polio vaccine or a shot to the moon have provided us in other areas.

These, then, are the questions, objectives, program, organization, relations to other agencies, and initial activities which we've been addressing in this planning effort. Our means of addressing them have been to hold meetings with groups such as yourselves, to visit other educational research and development establishments to see how they do it, and then to try to distill from these many voices some lessons and recommendations for those who will have to make the eventual decisions about an NIE. I don't know if I can tell you much more. There is one thing, and perhaps it will start the ball rolling. One of the things we're beginning to get a feel for is the program, the kinds of activities the NIE might undertake. We see four kinds of activities as the major thrusts. In fact, we see one of them as the prime thrust, an activity addressing identified problems in education—a problem-focused research program.

For example, here is a series of problems, perhaps too generally stated but which will give you a feeling for what we mean. One of the problems education faces today is that we have been unable to serve major portions of our constituency well. Children in the ghettos are not yet learning basic skills in the way they should; individuals going on to a career immediately after high school do not yet have the full range of opportunities open to them; people who have been out of high school or college for a number of years do not have enough access to retraining or refreshing. So there are major categories of potential educational clientele whose needs are not yet being met. What can we do to meet those needs? A program might include such things as experimentation, support of experimental programs, and more research into the character of the needs or the problems themselves.

Another problem which we all face is the shortage of finances for running school districts, the need to use what resources we have more effectively. Ideas here range from the greater use of technology to supplement labor to better management procedures for the school districts. An NIE might support a program of activities across that spectrum—understanding various kinds of staffing patterns, understanding the use of technology, understanding approved management procedures, developing them, and trying them out in the schools. So a major part of the NIE program will be activities addressing recognized problems in the educational system. But we can't go too far in that direction because we lack a basic understanding in many areas of education. We don't know enough about evaluation, about the instructional process, about the effects of administration and organization on the operation of school districts. We don't yet know well enough how to prepare a new generation of teachers. Therefore, another portion of the NIE program will undoubtedly be concerned with improving our education profession, improving teacher education, improving evaluation and the instructional process.

Third, the program will have to go into the fundamentals which underlie education—better appreciation of the individual and his learning characteristics, of the group, and of the institutions. I suspect that will be a much smaller part of the program. The final part will have to be that which is used to build the educational research and development community—training grants, institution building, information activities, exchanges of personnel among the various components of the system. A fair amount of the Institute program will address those activities. So I see four features to the NIE program: the largest, a problem-oriented part; the second having to do with the basis of education; the third with fundamental knowledge; and the fourth, building the educational research and development community.

Now I would really like to get your response. What do you think about a National Institute of Education? Does it look like it could be something that's important to you in your daily activities? What can we do to make it an important mechanism and part of the educational system?

Q. I don't know if Rand Corporation's reputation as a military research organization would help very much in this, but I would hope that your plan leads to a new institution in education that we don't have. Agriculture has had an extension service for many years. This organization seems to control incentives among the institutions in agriculture. We need something like this in

education. I would suggest that the accent be not so much on basic research as on development. The new institution should be able to control incentives among the various education institutions that are not responsible to one another as a true system should be. For example, colleges often talk about how important the schools are to them and how important it is to work with schools, but we really aren't that concerned. We don't have to be, and the state department doesn't have to be that concerned about what the college does, and so on throughout the system. We need an institution that acts like a cellophane overlay and controls the incentives. And don't staff it with professors of education and research. That killed the regional labs; they could have been developmental institutions. I'm talking as a research professor; we're good at it, but we're not responsible for development. We don't know how to do it. I don't know where you're going to get the development experts; you may have to go to industry, you may have to go to agriculture, and, lo and behold, you may have to honestly try to train them.

A. I must say that I agree with each of those points. First of all, I hope I didn't give the feeling that we were going to be principally research oriented. Certainly development is going to have to be a major portion of what we do. Second, we have been looking at the analogies in both agriculture and medicine, and the agriculture extension service comes up as a frequent model that might validly be followed in education. The two problems are, first, that it is reasonably easy to demonstrate success in agriculture but much harder to make it clear that you've been successful in education; and then there is a market mechanism, the incentive operating in the agriculture field, which to some degree drives farmers to introduce innovations to keep up with their competitors. There is a market mechanism and incentive system in agriculture that does not yet exist in education, and I think, therefore, that your question about incentives is exceedingly important. The other question about linkage among research, training, and practice is also important, and there the analogy to the teaching hospital in medicine has come to mind several times. The analogy in your case would, of course, be a school in which clinical teaching, teacher training, and research go on. I have talked with people at the John Adams High School in Portland, Oregon, which was established with that model very much in mind. It seems to be an exciting and interesting one, and I'd be interested in hearing from you whether any other of your teacher education institutions are looking for this close collaboration between school district, teacher training, and research facilities.

Q. It seems to me the idea of setting aside the Institute from the U. S. Office of Education is a serious mistake. We would be setting up a second type of organization in part to facilitate development. You cannot disregard the U. S. Office of Education, the 50 state departments of education, and the agencies which are going to take care of development.

A. I understand that point. I don't think setting aside the NIE from OE necessarily means that it won't be closely linked with OE. In fact, part of our concern has been the mechanisms which form a relationship between the Office of Education and the NIE. But I think the second part of your point, which is that it has to link as well to the state departments and the other agencies, is the important part. It isn't only important that the NIE link to the

Office of Education; it is important that it establish close association with these other agencies as well. For that reason I don't think its moving out of the Office of Education would necessarily cause problems. It does mean that it has to pay careful attention to these linkages.

Q. It seems to me that the analogies which link the Public Health Service with NIH and the Office of Education with the National Institute of Education can be carried that much further. Partially, at least, the success of the NIH has been the system of more or less categorical institutes with which Congress identifies on an individual basis and which are undergirded by two or three general institutes. This has created problems, particularly for the executive branch of government; nevertheless, the success of the NIH in the early years can be attributed to each institute's powerful council and mission, with which a particular group of congressmen and senators identifies. I think that if thought were given to the establishment of the NIE, this would be worth serious consideration simply because the concept of research in education is fairly nebulous. But if we have various issues such as the right to read, it can be the baby of somebody in Congress. Of course when you create a Gestalt of separate levers, it becomes very powerful for the NIE. The other comment I would like to make is that apparently you are anticipating one of the serious mistakes that was made in the Public Health Service regarding the linking of research, service, and clinical training – the hiatus that existed between the old Public Health Service, the so-called Division of State and Community Services, and the NIH. I think a very strong liaison office is necessary if you go in this direction. You come back almost to the need for an assistant secretary for education who holds the two together.

A. The intention of the bill is that NIE and OE would both report to the assistant secretary for education. Your point about the categorical institutes at NIH is a very important one. A little history is interesting, though, in the sense that these categorical institutes developed over time. The NIH started, and then very quickly had a National Cancer Institute and so on. I would favor, if there are such institutes, their development not in the early days of the NIE, when it will be hard enough to find a staff for one, but rather eventually. Let me make one other point. There have been suggestions for separate institutes. The two that have just been developed are the National Institute for Instructional Technology, which the Commission on Instructional Technology recommended, and the National Institute for Teacher Education, which the AACTE has recommended. I find the idea of separate institutes a little bit hard to take at this point because I see education as too closely interlinked; fragmentation sets up barriers. However, the idea of visible centers, which might, as they grow, become national institutes, seems more attractive to me.

Q. One of my concerns is that we don't do what we've done in the past. My point here is that I hope that you don't talk with us now and then forget about this organization. I hope that this linkage is such that we have a part in it. I, for one, in my short experience with teacher education, am tired of people coming in from the field who are going to solve all the problems. They work at it for five years and leave. We're going to be here all the time, so I hope that we see one another many, many times. The third grade teacher down in the slums, as well as the education professor, must also give continual input, because

otherwise, I don't think the thing is going to work. I applaud this idea, but I hope we don't see one another once a year. I hope that the AACTE, which has an office in Washington, is intimately involved in the development. Otherwise, no matter how good these ideas are, they're not going to work because they're not going to get plugged in to the institutions that are going to do the work.

A. I'll take that one step further. I don't think it would be sufficient even if we talked once a month with someone from the AACTE Washington office. That's not going to get the findings of NIE out into the field, and it's not going to bring in the problems of teachers colleges or the problems of the school systems. What we really need is some close link, operational and continuing, between the people who are doing the work or the teaching and those who are doing the research. What I am looking for are ideas about how we can establish those mechanisms. It's not going to be easy. Obviously, at the other end of the spectrum are the researchers, who can't spend all their time coordinating with everyone either. There has to be some effective, parsimonious mechanism for linking the problems of education with the people doing research.

Q. I heard you make a comment which kind of opened my eyes. You said that a relatively minor part of your work would be involved with learning styles and techniques, which bothered me because I think what we really need is not more research on learning styles but more research into the applications of what we already know about learning styles and techniques. And perhaps this leads to my second question. I think we really need some research or some ideas about why public institutions are not more effective than they are. We talk about the breakdown of law, legal institutions, the breakdown of health services, in spite of all the money the states are spending on them. And of course education is another area. We have an awful lot of research going on in various places. We're spending a lot of money – perhaps not enough – in education, but somehow the results aren't there. What's holding us up? Is this a failure of all public institutions, and if so, why? I'd like to suggest those topics for some research activities.

A. As I said when I was introduced, I've been trying to teach a course that doesn't have much content because there isn't much to teach yet about this problem. Rand itself has been engaged in working with the city of New York on how one improves services in fire, police, health, and so on. In all of these areas, I think the major factor is that we're dealing with agencies which have no single, easy measure of the quality of their own service, in contrast with the private agency, which has its profit and can determine whether it's doing a good job or not by how well it does in the market place. That's a little too simple, but for the moment let's say it's that way. In education there is no such single, simple measure. In the case of public agencies, they are all monopolies, and they get soft and lazy in some sense that way. But I think the former is the more important limitation. And the real question is, how can we improve the service provided by all of our public systems? I think most people in these systems want to improve the service, but they're locked into failure of incentive systems, failure of information systems, and so on. So I couldn't agree more with what you've just said, that the major concern has to be how to make our public institutions more responsive to their clientele and better able to perform as most of them want to. As far as the need for more research into application of

learning styles is concerned, when we say development, I think part of what we have in mind there is making use of what is already known to improve the education process. As I've already said, I think development will be a major concern of the Institute.

Q. What arrangements have you made to evaluate the achievement of objectives, assuming you do get a list of objectives that are good?

A. We've arranged to have Congress review our budget each year and the Office of Management and Budget before that. In the case of educational research and development I think the skepticism and the problem of getting support are so great, that we will be in a situation in which the budget will not grow unless the Institute can demonstrate clearly that it is being effective. Now that clear demonstration, and again we're dealing with a situation in which there is no single measure, is going to have to occur in a number of ways, and I don't know quite what those will be. But I'm sure you, yourselves, will be part of it. You'll be out there watching us, and if you see a lot of money going down the tubes, why I hope and expect you'll be letting your congressmen know; and if the NIE is successful and effective and is really doing things that find a way into your teaching and the training of your teachers, you'll be pounding on congressional doors and saying, "These guys are really helping us; let's put some more money into that." I think that's the way it's going to have to be done for a while.

Q. I'm afraid that you are not going to get the message that in order to improve materially the quality of the teachers who are in the classrooms of our schools, we will need models of total programs built for institutions to live with. This means we must have the think-tank fellow to help us form these better models – not just better courses or better laboratories in instructional technology, but better total, unified programs of teacher education. Then we've got to have some help from the National Institute to get the funding that makes it possible for some of us to have our rigidities cracked up. We've got a rigidity in my university. I'm not giving away any secret to you, but our institution in the undergraduate program for preservice education of teachers is as stiff as a corpse. It's just as rigid in too many places. We can't get our heads up to breathe, to get a new look at the total program of the institution. We need an agency at the Institute visible enough to tell the American people that the education of her teachers is so terribly important that we've got to change priorities and we've got to put resources behind it. I don't know whether your NIE concept permits you to intercede for the vital needs of existing institutional structures to help in their own reconstruction both from interaction outside and inside, but that is what I think we've got to have. I haven't heard you do justice to this idea of a National Foundation for Teacher Education. I don't care what the name of it is; it can be a department or division of the NIE just as well, but the function that most of the men and women in this room are concerned about is how we can make the study of education for professional purposes a more significantly effective operation.

A. Perhaps I haven't done justice to it. I feel probably not as strongly since my experience isn't the same, but I agree completely with it. I think the gist of my feeling was expressed when I said the teacher is in the place where the action is – at the cutting edge. All the improvements have to come to bear at the

teacher processing. Anything we can do to improve our teachers, including building better models for teacher education, building a system which continually provides teachers with new information and enables them to upgrade their skills, would be close to the most important thing the NIE could do. The teacher is the central feature in the educational system and is going to be so for time immemorial as far as I'm concerned. Therefore, we have to work with them and improve their preparation.

Q. I'd like to elaborate a little more on the question of evaluation. It seems to me that you leave a moral approach to evaluation out of your plans, that the decisions whether or not to continue NIE in total would actually be made on a purely political basis. This is the kind of thing that's been happening to some of the programs in the National Science Foundation, and I would suggest that we might learn something from the difficulties they've been having.

A. One of the notions we do have in mind is that a major part of the Institute's intramural activities would be an examination of the needs of education and a kind of systematic view, with many visiting scholars, of many short term concerns. For example, we talk about reading as a problem in education now. What is really the dimension of that problem; what can be done about it? An extensive program would be launched, under which one obtains a fair understanding of what's known, what's been done, what needs to be done, and the real dimensions of the problem. I suspect that this will be an activity under way at the Institute, that kind of investigation of educational problems. Along with that would come some objective criteria or some ideas of what a program of research addressed to the problems of reading would be like at the Institute. From that program would come some guidance for the continuation of that program and some indications of what success would mean and what failure would mean. Therefore, I think rather than continuously evaluate the whole Institute, individual programs of the Institute should be continually evaluated against a stated objective of the program. So I agree that you have to continually see whether you're getting anywhere, and decide whether you've reached your objective or not, and determine what has to be done to further that objective.

Q. It seems to me that the things we need to do through this kind of an institute are dangerous things; they are threatening things both to us as an establishment and to society, represented by the Congress, which has to put the money into this. The thing that frightens me is that we won't be able to do what we need to do because we won't be able to get the support to do it because it will be threatening. It seems to me that we can spend a lot of time on process, and that's about where we're hung up, when so many of the problems we face are problems of purpose. One of the difficulties of using the analogies of either health or agriculture is that the purposes in both of those fields are fairly simple to define, whereas in education we're just not sure of what we're trying to do. I don't know what the answer is, but my concern is that with an institute like this that depends upon political support, we're going to be forced to do a better job of doing what we're doing now, which we know isn't effective. I don't know where we go from there.

A. I am aware of that problem, and I have gotten about as far as you said you've gotten to an understanding of it. I don't envy the director of NIE, whoever he may be, because he is going to have not just one constituency but many,

and all will be concerned intimately with this question of what education is about and what we are trying to do with our education system. I don't know what mechanisms or what means we will have to develop to be able to do the important and threatening things, but I can only hope that we do develop some.

Q. This speaks exactly, though, for the need for an intramural program that is linked with the extramural. That is, it is in the intramural program that the most radical ideas, which perhaps began with extramural support, are tried out. It is in the intramural program – and again I have to use the analogy of NIH – that each year one or two potential breakthroughs in health are flouted before the Congress. Most of these ideas were generated through extramural support, but because they were radical, they were brought into the intramural, clinical center and then refined through a process of collaborative research.

A. Here I find the analogy typical, though, because I would imagine it would be much harder in a federal institution under federal support to do intramurally those things which are really threatening. In fact, I would have made the opposite argument that those things which look threatening ought to be done by some consortium of schools operating on its own with the federal government providing support because it wants to do it.

Q. But you're working with people, and in our institution and in our schools we have people whose lives and destinies are in our hands. At the clinical center of intramural research – the NIH, for example – people come in knowing that this is their last chance, and they will do anything.

A. As far as the procession of scholars goes, it depends a bit on what you view the intramural research program as being concerned with. If it's long-term, basic, scholarly research, I'm not sure the intramural program at the NIE would be doing that. It might be, but that isn't the necessary model. The kinds of long-term studies you're talking about might well be done more appropriately in schools of education and in the universities, funded but not actually conducted by the NIE. As far as the immediate help goes, let's take a diversity-of-staffing point of view. Maybe I'm naive, but if the NIE did some studies of various staffing patterns in those states where they could be done, or under those circumstances where they could be done, and was able to demonstrate fairly concretely and carefully and validly that various patterns different from the existing ones were effective and provided good education, I suspect that would ease the passage of legislation to change the limitations that you are fighting. Now I understand that there are other parts of the political process which would be introduced, but I can see some research and development helping in that process of changing the legislative environment in which education operates.

Q. I think one of the problems any such new institute faces is one of credibility, and I wonder what kind of safeguard you would build in. For instance, would the director be free to say what he pleased, or would he receive a phone call from the President one day, saying, "You don't have a job; I don't like what you said"? I think this question would be absolutely essential if you want acceptance on the part of the educational community.

A. At present, the statement in the legislation is that the director is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and there has been some discussion in meetings on this point. What is the proper relationship, politically, to this? We have the tradition in science of a relatively

independent and nonpolitical character. On the other hand, the argument on the opposite side goes this way: this Institute will have to have the support of the President because it's going to want to do things which are dangerous and threatening, maybe not the most dangerous and threatening, but it's not going to have a smooth road. It's going to have to have budget allocations which come through the Office of Management and Budget, and unless the director has the political support of the President, he might just as well resign and not worry about being fired. From the practical political realities of education, education research being different from physics research or even health research, you'll want that political back-up and you might as well make sure that you have it. I find both of these arguments kind of compelling, but I suspect the latter is going to win out. At the National Institutes of Health, the director is appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, not by the President, and is a career appointment rather than a political appointment. That might be followed in this case.

Q. I think there is a growing realization that many of the problems which are worth solving today are far too complex for any one profession operating unilaterally to have any kind of impact. Yet my experience in dealing with federal agencies is that they agree philosophically but not at the level of the dollar. You get a little bit for action, almost nothing for training, and nothing for research that is of a professional nature. And yet it seems to me that in education we can't ignore helping the kids, we can't ignore the social conditions that go on around them; we know that, and yet there is very little of a professional nature that the federal government has helped us do. I think there is more of a readiness in the professions to do this than there is in the government to support it.

A. Of course I come from an organization which prides itself on interdisciplinary research, and I think that while we're nowhere as successful as we'd like to be, we do it better than many organizations. The concerns I've always had about the ability to do interdisciplinary research have to do with the university structure. It's probably not as true in colleges of teacher education, but if you look at schools of arts and sciences you see narrow and rigid disciplinary boundaries. Getting people to cooperate in research across those boundaries is a very difficult task because advancement within your discipline depends on publication in your discipline. So I'm not disagreeing that the federal government hasn't been helpful in funding, but I would say that the institutions for doing it at the university level are weak also. Getting interdisciplinary research done is an exceedingly difficult task but one that in education especially is quite important.

A. Let me make this case. Suppose we attempt a vastly different way of conducting preschool education which has a lot to do with inspiring social consciousness and so forth. Would you imagine it would be easier to do that at a school run by a national or federal agency in Washington – kind of visible – or at a demonstration school run by a local school district because it wanted to do it and had the local political support?

Q. First you have to prove that it will work, and I think that would be the role of the intramural program.

Q. Isn't the problem that a great many of our so-called dangerous ideas

have been done by small groups of institutions, and then they haven't been sent out? They stay in those institutions whereas if they are done on a national level, they do get out, they do attract attention.

A. Well that hits the problem which I think is the most critical. How does one disseminate information?

Q. I think our educational enterprise has some pretty and some not so pretty characteristics. Two of the outstanding ones in the latter category are that we have a deplorable tendency to spread our resources too thinly and, something related, we resist evaluation of the things we do. In the first case, we try to work with all the state departments, we try to teach all the subjects, we try to educate every kind of teacher, and our main plea, as Congress hears it, is that we need more money and then we'll do a better job. We're not able to prove it whether we get the money or not. If you take the money away, it doesn't seem to make much difference. So, intramural, extramural, I think that we need a broader profession to define some reasonably limited objectives and get some results, or find out if we know how to do something or not, whether it's a good way or a bad way. I think whether it's dangerous is not so much the question. I think it's more a matter of good ideas or bad ideas, not dangerous ones *per se*. But I'm very impressed with your concern, and I would share it, that Congress is going to have its scapels ready after a very short honeymoon and that the Institute and its supporters would be well advised to have some short term objectives ready to go that are well defined, that focus resources, and that have good means of evaluation that an intelligent layman can understand and respect. Say, "Look, we did something." And if Congress then doesn't want to support it, we can parade it before the profession and the population at large and get a lot of support.

Q. I have a somewhat different kind of question. I was wondering, as I attempted to conceive of the organization, how it would supply all of the nerve endings needed to interpret and organize the many signals from the many sources, professional and otherwise, and condense them into some useful form? How big is the organization going to be, and how is the staff to be selected without its becoming rather bureaucratic, in order to supply these unique kinds of nerve endings that are needed?

A. As I've said, I want to see the Institute linked into all of these people who have problems. As you recognize that this is important to do, you recognize how difficult it is to do. One answer I can give you – a personal opinion – is that I would like to see the Institute have a continuing flux of people through it for short and long terms, not a cadre of people who come and sit there for years and years and contemplate each others navels, but rather a place in which there is a small corps of people who provide some continuity and management into which school superintendents, or professors, or people from colleges of teacher education, or school teachers can come for periods ranging from a few weeks to six months to a year, for particular projects or conferences. So part of the NIE's linkage with the outside world would come just because it would have people going through it. Certainly it's going to have a number of advisory committees. And let me make another point, something I haven't said before. I did point out that the community of educational research and development is underdeveloped compared to what it should be. If we look at our agencies and enter-

prises in our country, we see that a lot of the information flows among researchers and scientists and scholars at various points in the system, that there are links among them. For example, in engineering it could be the applied scientists who know what's going on in the basic research laboratory and who transfer the information. I would like to see groups of researchers and developers and problem-solvers at various points in the system—in the local school districts, in the state agencies. The network of knowledge will come because these people communicate and transfer and flow, and so I see part of it as just getting more scholars and scientists out into operative education, part of it as seeing many of those people flow through the NIE. For example, I would like to see each of the bureaus in the Office of Education have a small research and development staff, not centralized but actually decentralized to that extent. I think one should actively encourage the development of such groups of people because they are the cutting edge and link between the NIE and the various bureaus and operating agencies. I'd like to see that model developed.

Q. As far as the research end of it is concerned, I get a little bit disturbed about the notion that you're going to have a procession of scholars coming through. For if there's one thing we don't need, it's any more short-term stays. The only kind of research that's going to help us at all is going to take us five to 10 years to complete. We've got a rash of this other stuff that never adds up to anything. Unless we're willing to do some long-term genetic kinds of studies we'll see the kind of thing that really fouls up the group—people coming through for a year's time for nothing much else but a nice tour of duty. I'm sure you'll have lots of applicants. If the Institute is focused on trying to get some immediate help, then we probably don't need research at all because most of our problems are political, social, legal, and so forth. You don't need any research for this. If the audience for the Institute is the profession, this isn't going to help much either, because the people who need to know what the problem is are the legislators, the people who are really making public decisions about education. This is the audience to which you need to address yourself, the general public and the government bodies, which in fact determine policy in the central states. It would be very nice, for example, to have a diversified staff. We could probably save money and work a little bit more efficiently, but this doesn't change the legal structure of the state; we're not going to be doing much with the public schools or any universities.

Accountability and Social Change

LEON M. LESSINGER
Callaway Professor of Education
Georgia State University, Atlanta

To argue that our conference theme of social change and teacher education is a vital one is to indulge in the obvious for we live in an age of massive and shocking change. When men and women are bewildered by such change, our efforts must speak to one of their urgent problems, developing and improving an educational system to cope with a society in the throes of intellectual, technological, and social revolutions that are far advanced. Our time is marked, as Robert Oppenheimer said in a speech to Columbia University, by the dissolution of authority and beliefs in ritual and in temporal order. It should not surprise us, then, that the school is not what it was, that there is great student unrest and patron dissatisfaction, and that the issue of relevancy is the central issue in our professional life.

Professor Huston Smith, philosopher and teacher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has posed the issue of social change most poignantly. I would like to read you some of his insights in a marvelous little book called *Condemned Meaning*. He said:

> We live in a time when history appears to be rushing to some sort of climax. New knowledge breaks over us with a force and constancy that sweeps us off our feet and keeps us from regaining them. Life's tempos quicken, as if to the beat of a conductor crying 'faster, faster!' With moon travel we are prepared to make a pass at the infinite. With DNA we are thinking of renewing our offspring. What have we not done? What may we yet do? The future looks dazzled, or rather it would if it were not for one thing, a growing question as to whether there is any point to the whole affair. For we are witnesses to one of the great ironies of history. The century, which in the West has conquered disease, erased starvation, dispersed affluence, elongated life, and educated everybody, has generated the gloomiest depiction of the human condition ever rendered. An occasional Greek wondered whether it might not have been better never to have been born, but an in-growing pessimism seems to characterize most of our writers. Always, unvaryingly, they depict a world that is meaningless or absurd. Open nearly any book, enter almost any theater, and life is a lie, my sweet. It builds green trees and eases your eyes and draws you unto them. Then when you are there in the shade, and you breathe in and say, 'Oh God, how beautiful,' that's when the bird on the branch lets go his droppings and hits you on the head. Never have men known so much while doubting whether it adds up to anything. Never has life been covertly so empty while overtly so full.

In the face of this void of meaning in our time, in this sustained crisis of

authority in our time, teacher education must take on different dimensions. Accountability is the public policy declaration that speaks to those different dimensions.

I used to enjoy the late Drew Pearson's predictions of things to come. I imagine you did also. There is something in us that wants to know the future. I never bothered to check up on his predictions, but I always felt good about them. I am going to make a prediction, and I trust you will afford me the same grace that I gave to Drew Pearson and not check up on me.

One of our speakers said there were five words. We are all word merchants. I have three, and I am going to predict that these three will form the core of the major debates in the 1970's. I think their implications for teaching will be awesome. I am going to refer to two of them – one in particular, another just in passing, and the third I will not talk about at all. I predict that three central ideas will dominate the 1970's in response to this awesome change and that their use and understanding will profoundly alter the nature of our education system, the notion of who is an educator, and the place we afford the educational venture in the scheme of our priorities. Those three similar ideas are in the words "accountability," "stewardship," and "celebration."

If you detect a religious cast to these conceptions, I am not at all surprised, although I did not consciously go to that area to find them. I am not surprised at their flavor because our technology has forced us all to attend to a series of sermons more powerful than the combined lessons of a dozen universities. Let me cite but one of these mass lessons: the striking picture on our television screen of our own earth, as the spaceship stocked with a fixed supply of resources on an endless journey in a hostile envelope has left its mark on our brooding psyches.

The generalizations are clear. We are stewards of a glorious home that God has given, a planet stocked with life and beauty and opportunity beyond telling, a heritage of freedom bought so dearly in the sacrifice of those who have gone before us. It does not take prophetic vision to know that in the 1970's we shall all account for that stewardship, that many of us will discover the very real connection between the lives we lead, the careers we pursue, the institutions we support, the thoughts we think, the values we hold, the priorities we attack, and our very future as a people.

I do not have time to develop all these ideas, but I will explore one, accountability, and by implication, stewardship. I leave for you the consideration of what in the world celebration has to do with any of these.

Accountability is a policy declaration, adopted by a legal body such as a board of education or state legislature, requiring regular outside reports of dollars spent to achieve results. The concept, in my judgment, rests on three fundamental pillars: student accomplishment, independent review of that accomplishment, and a public report given by the independent reviewer. I think the grand jury, the congressional hearing, and the fiscal audit are powerful and well tested examples of means for achieving accountability. Education can draw from these.

A growing number of influential people are becoming convinced that it is possible to hold the schools accountable as other important agencies in the public and private sector are held to account for the results of their activities.

In his March 3 educational message of this year, President Nixon stated, "From these considerations we derive another new concept, accountability. School administrators and school teachers alike are responsible for their performance, and it is in their interest as well as in the interest of their pupils that they be held accountable."

Another example from among many that I could cite is this one from the preamble of the current contract between the city of New York and the United Federation of Teachers. It reads: "The board of education and the union recognize that the major problem of our school system is the failure to educate all our students and the massive academic retardation which exists, especially among minority group students. The board and the union therefore agree to join in an effort, in cooperation with universities, community school boards, and parent organizations, to seek solutions to this major problem and to develop objective criteria of professional accountability."

I want to cite for you 10 developments, from among literally hundreds, perhaps thousands, that have been taking place in the last year. I do not cite these to give you the impression of a bandwagon effect, but simply to make the point that something is happening out there, that our clients, those whom we serve, are uneasy, and are taking ideas, perhaps not as well thought out as they might be. Nonetheless, this much activity must signify something.

The Oregon State Department of Education has employed a director of educational audit. I came from a week with their top leaders – university, public school, and lay leaders – a week called the Academy of Educational Engineering. The Virginia State Board of Education has encouraged and authorized, with U. S. Office of Education stimulation, the conversion of Title I funds through performance contracting to eliminate deficits in the basic academic skills for minority and other students. The guidelines for the federal bilingual and drop-out prevention programs have built on those notions which I indicated earlier, and require an independent accomplishment audit. After a recent talk in Kentucky to a group of legislators, board members, and school people, a young fellow ran up and said that he had just been named the assistant superintendent in charge of accountability in Louisville, Kentucky. I didn't dare ask what he did. Several states already have legislation formulated to pursue accountability. The Office of Economic Opportunity is funding 21 school centers to experiment with performance contracts and incentives built on the Texarkana model and going well beyond it. Three of those 21 commend themselves to us, in which teachers have agreed to take a bonus if they achieve and to suffer a penalty if they don't, again in the basic skill areas with the disadvantaged children.

The Dallas, Texas school system is seeking bids to eliminate basic school failure among disadvantaged children, the performance contract to be checked by an outside audit. The Florida State Legislature has appropriated 1.2 million dollars of what I call developmental capital. I have the honor of serving as the chairman of their Board of Governors, a nonpaid position in which we try to help make investments in pursuit of accountability, investments through teachers and students and others. The Education Commission of the States, in its July 8 meeting discussed the theme – you've guessed it – accountability, and it has adopted accountability as the focus of the 1970's. The president of

the National School Boards Association has made accountability a theme of his administration, and on it goes.

Clearly, a new educational movement is on the way. The school systems of America are entering what the *Washington Post* has termed an age of accountability. Sometimes when I am introduced, people say, pro or con, that I am either the father or I am not the father of accountability. To lay that to rest once and for all, I went back to Plutarch. And I don't think that even he is the father of accountability. It's a very old notion that has been rediscovered. Mark his words well. They say it better than anything that I have written or that I have seen written. He wrote this in a fabulous little book called *Education of Children*, which is about 2,000 years old: "Such fathers as commit their sons to tutors and teachers and themselves never witness or overhear their instructions deserve rebuke for they fall far short of their obligations. They are themselves to undertake examinations of their children every few days, and not place them in the disposition of a wage earner. Even the latter will bestow greater care on the children if they know that they will periodically be called to account."

Here, he says, the witty saying of the hustler is apt: "Nothing fattens the horse so much as the king's eye." If you were to pursue the history of the British industrial revolution, important for us as we embrace new management concepts in education, you would find that the major impetus for modern management came when the king was no longer able to supervise, to check, and to find out, and industries began to collapse. That is no blow at educators, simply a review of the truth. Many of the older school laws in America call for accountability. One Georgia law of 1819 said a teacher couldn't be paid unless the children made certain stipulated gains.

Accountability's pointed thrust for a regular public report of an outside review of demonstrated student achievement that was promised for the allocation of funds will fundamentally alter public education. Let me explore with you several of these major changes. How can one be accountable? I think in that question lies the great promise of this notion. Admittedly, it is also a dangerous notion; one can use this as a way to prevent funding or to discredit. But it also has another side: it can be a catalyst for reform. Let me indicate some of the major changes that have to come if we are going to be accountable, in the sense that I have been exploring it with you.

In the first place, successful implementation of an accountability policy would shift the focus in the school system from input to output, from teaching to learning. A growing research literature points up the independence of teaching and learning. There can, happily, be learning as a result of teaching, but it doesn't follow that if you give me a credential and label me a teacher, you know anything more than that. This suggests that the present and traditional methods of requesting resources, as well as the principal bases for judging the quality in terms of resources allocated in the form of inputs, which is the way we do it—the number of teachers, the space, their degrees, their equipment, and all of the rest—critical and important as they are, they are critical and important in terms of results, what happens to young people, what they can do as a result of the allocation of those resources, as seen by someone not connected with that particular enterprise.

In principle, the American commitment of education has been that every

child should have access to an adequate education. This is the familiar and the powerful and the noble notion of equal educational opportunity. But alas, in pursuit of that, we have confused equal educational opportunity with the allocation of resources. And when a child has failed to learn, school personnel have often assigned him a label—"slow," "disadvantaged," "retarded," and the rest. Accountability triggers a revised commitment, that every child shall learn with the stipulation "or else," and the "or else" is that someone else may be competing. I didn't say that they could do a better job, but there is the clear notion of "or else."

Every child shall learn. We have made investments totalling in the billions of dollars now, and we are not bankrupt. We can say on the basis of evidence with all kinds of young people that every child can learn and that giving him a label, as a short circuit for dealing with him, can no longer be tolerated. Such a revision demands a "can do" spirit of enterprise; a willingness to change a system that does not work and find one that does; seeking of causes of failure as often in the system, its personnel, its organization, its technology, and its knowledge base, as is now sought solely in students. I think the recent call for every man's right to read clearly foreshadows this new notion of equity of results as a counterpart to equality of opportunity.

A third major effect of accountability of schools centers on the technology of instruction and the notion of better standard practice in America's school rooms. I think that as we pursue accountability, we will be forced to grapple with the notions of standard practice, good practice, poor practice, and malpractice; and we will have to grapple with the notion of the time lag between identifying something that's better and its introduction into the classroom. We will not sit passively around for 30 or 40 years. If we do, we will not be able to be accountable for results. Without accountability for results, the spread of good practice and the adoption of better technology move at snail's pace. In this connection, remember that technology is more than equipment; equipment may not even be present in technology. It is validated practice. To put it very crudely it is what works in the pursuit of objectives.

To drive home that point, or perhaps to make it a little clearer, let me talk about the nonequipment portion of technology, instructional technology. Let's talk about personal behavior. The important part in validated practice played by professional competence and interpersonal behavior is not used in many classrooms. There is a wealth of evidence acquired over the last 30 years about the ways in which people interact, learn from each other, intervene, aid, support, and undermine each other's work; yet there are few teachers who have progressed beyond the classroom methods of several generations ago. In few other fields of any consequence are the patterns of behavior so predictable, so unchanged, so inefficient in terms of the contemporary human organism and how it learns, as are those commonly found in our classrooms.

You have it. Accountability is the hair shirt of education. It is the response at budget time. It is the cry of the black parent in the ghetto, who said to me not so long ago, "I know what accountability is. If you don't learn my kid I'm going to fire you." It is not team teaching. It isn't this year's new word. It is the response of our clients, those who feel they are not being served.

There is little to be gained by defensiveness or protestation on the part of

education, nor is the ringing statement of the truly magnificent achievements of public schools an effective antidote. Hand-wringing or defensiveness is not the same as problem-solving.

I'd like to treat three major elements for engineering accountability into public education. I can treat them only briefly. The first is development capital, the setting aside of money for investments by school leaders in performance contracts. Accountability is best seen as a response to the pursuit of incentives, rather than a cudgel to be used to trim costs.

The second one is the notion of the modes of proof. In pursuit of accountability, if we are not to make mistakes, we are going to have to broaden our notions of assessment. We are going to have to rediscover the work of others in the 1930's, '40's, and '50's. We are not embarassed in terms of research; we are faulty in terms of our utilization. I think this outside review deserves a little more exploration. To me it is the heart of accountability and can restore and raise credibility. The outside review component is much like the one in science. Science relies for its very existence on qualified independent review and replication. Nothing is established in science unless and until it can be demonstrated by someone other than he who claims discovery or invention. Scientists are neither better people nor better scholars than educators. They do not pursue more scientifically or intrinsically better problems than teachers. They are simply subject to better monitoring by a system that both encourages and mobilizes the criticism of competent peers throughout their lives. Education, on the other hand, substitutes the gaining of credentials or a license at a single point in a career for a continuing process of independent review and mandated accomplishment replication. I think that is our Achilles heel, and I think it can be corrected in a professionally dignified manner.

The final component that I want to talk about is educational engineering. It strikes me that there is a whole field that is being purchased by school people, college people. It goes by various names—systems, design and analysis, management by objectives—the field of instructional technology. There are some around this country, and I am one of them, who are trying to develop this field, to see its interrelationships so that we can develop a process for engineering good practice into standard practice. We can identify several components already. We know that one has to locate or design good practice. It must then be adapted and adopted, and those are different processes, adaptation being a professional process, adoption being a political and a social one. It has to be installed, which means training and logistical support. It must be reviewed, with feedback, and then, hopefully, it can be turned into the rest of the system.

We ought to be done with those little things that flop down there with all of their titles and are introduced to visitors while the classroom itself remains unchanged. I think this explains the great popularity right now of performance contracting with private enterprise. I would urge you to make a distinction between performance contracting, which is a tool, and the notion of accountability, which is a policy declaration. People are confusing the two. There is nothing about performance contracting which says it must go to private enterprise. I am pleased to tell you that there are at least two colleges I know of that have come to talk about teacher training institutions taking contracts, saying, "We can do anything the private sector can do, and do it better."

Let me conclude, perhaps in the vein in which I started. The first exercise in accountability might center on the care and nurture of our children, and I will remind you to think of Mr. Plutarch. We are stewards in their education and training, and the education system we have created consists of more than our schools. It wouldn't surprise me at all to find that in pursuit of accountability we will find what our limits are, what our burdens are, and what our capabilities are for discharging those burdens. Maybe the time will come when we will say, "No, we can't do it, we are incompetent. If you want that done, others must be involved, including the family." And we will not react so easily to "Yes, but nobody else has all the children all the time." Because in the pursuit of that logic we may find that we have destroyed our public school system. So we are stewards of an educational system. We are the paid employees to whom Plutarch refers. Over the years, we have gradually dispatched more and more of our personal responsibilities for the young to hired professionals and professional strangers. The good and bad results of our stewardship are coming home for all to see and feel and experience.

Perhaps the most fitting summary of the power of accountability as a policy is contained in an actual decree issue by a mayor in New Mexico. Those of you who have lived in the Southwest or in desert areas know how critical water is. The Zuni dance for rain. If water doesn't appear, people are literally destroyed. Here was a mayor desperate: no rain. He did the only thing he could do. He went to those he felt should be accountable, the clergy. And this was his decree: "If within the preemptory period of eight days from the date of this decree, rain does not fall abundantly, no one will go to mass or say prayers. If the drought continues eight days more, the churches and chapels shall be burned; missals, rosaries, and other objects of devotion will be destroyed. If, finally, in the third period of eight days, it shall not rain, all the priests, friars, nuns and saints, male and female, will be beheaded." Fortunately for the clergy, Divine Providence responded to this "no nonsense" approach by sending torrential downpours within four days.

Presidents and deans of schools of education, bureaucrats, parents, fellow citizens, the crises in education are not yet that bad, but we had better take heed.

DAVID D. DARLAND
Associate Executive Secretary
National Commission on Teacher Education
and Professional Standards, NEA*
Washington, D. C.

I propose to pick up on the theme that I believe was implicit throughout Dr. Lessinger's speech. I think he was saying that the true test of a free and open society is not necessarily the ultimate goals but the procedures used in attaining them. I think that what we are really seeking here are some procedures in attaining goals. One of the things we have been talking about is the whole process of how we establish goals. I heard three speakers talk about the reordering of our values, and in thinking this over, I am not so sure they weren't talking more about reordering our priority system. For example, I have the feeling that all of us would uphold the concept of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, which is a value. The problem is not the value itself; it is the ordering of priorities because some people have been deprived for years of the right of the Fifth Amendment.

A second thing that I thought of in listening here and thinking about this assignment in reference to accountability, was the context in which we find ourselves. When I think about a context, there are three things that occur to me, and they all are related to the fact that we are in a situation different from any one man has ever been in before.

The first factor is that we can commit the irretrievable error in many ways, not just atomically. We might do it, for example, by interfering with the melting of the polar ice cap, by pollution, or by over-population. Look at what's happening to the corn crop in the Midwest now because of the fungus. Think of the research that is being done in pharmacology to develop drugs that will counter artificially created germs. We are doing all kinds of things whereby we can commit the irretrievable error. The young people know this, and they keep reminding us of it. It is implicit in many of their acts and certainly implicit in many of their concerns.

The second thing that is different is the collapse of time-space. There is the mother who saw her son shot live on TV in the Vietnam war; happily, he was shot in the leg, not killed. We have war for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. We don't know what this is doing to us, but we know one thing, that we perceive what someone else perceives and wants us to perceive when we are looking at the box.

*Since the 1970 School for Executives, the Commission has been merged into a new Council of Instruction and Professional Development of the NEA.

The last factor that is different is philosophical. It has to do with the whole dynamics of technological models. We have now left this earth. We have landed on another heavenly body and successfully returned, and every day we get more evidence to confirm the idea that if we can do *this* type of thing, why can't we take a little money and do something in education? I would remind all of us that we have literally set up a czar in the middle of a democracy. We gave that technological enterprise, which is a political enterprise to beat the Russians, absolute power, total economic support, all the equipment and manpower that it needed, and it did the job.

This is the kind of context in which we find ourselves. I have some deep feelings about the humanistic kind of values that we'd better think about in this respect, but I think that it also has something to do with our confusion of goals. We have lost some of our old moorings, and we are searching for new ones. Certainly, the young people are saying that we are somewhere adrift.

Now, I will comment on accountability, and then I want to pick up on the problem of "who and what." I want to refer back to my earlier statement, that maybe the true test of a democracy in an open society is not the ultimate goal *per se* but the procedures we use. I want to fall back a little on the philosophical idea that maybe we need to always consider means and ends, or procedures and goals, in the same context, recognizing that they are both going to adjust and change as we go along.

But as I listen and read more and more about the concept of accountability, it seems to me that those of us most directly concerned with teacher education, and particularly with in-service education, have some very delicate tasks to perform in creating procedures whereby there is an involvement in the dynamics of whatever it is that we mean when we talk about accountability. And I don't think that we are very clear on the whole concept of what we mean by accountability. I do know this, that the word "relevance" is being replaced by "accountability" in the professional literature.

We all talk about the militant teacher, and, indeed, these are the products of those of us in teacher education. When you listen and talk to some people, they would claim that there is almost an abberation of behavior among teachers – what you might call panacea syndromes. In my organization I can see this in operation very clearly. When I first came 10 years ago, we were going to solve the problems of American education through that organization with sanctions; if things didn't go right, we were going to sanction somebody. Then we moved from sanctions to something else. Now we are going to solve the problems of American education through negotiations.

Now you can hold that the whole concept of negotiation is absolutely imperative, but one imperative doesn't solve the problem. You need other aspects or other procedures, and that's one of the things I want to get at here. If classroom teachers are a key to the whole problem of education, if they are front and center, if they are pivotal, then we must discover some way of involving them, of gaining their commitment; and I don't think that we often do this. There are exceptions, but the problem, it seems to me, is the absence of involvement. In many cases, teachers have developed an almost ardent distrust of the procedures because they haven't been involved in their creation.

The reason I raised the whole spectrum of the militant teacher and what

some people would claim to be an abberation of behavior, is that if this is true, we had better take a good look at it. But perhaps what is most important here is that we do have an educational establishment in this country from kindergarten through graduate school, and it seems to me that we are beginning to create a juxta-professional establishment. It hasn't developed yet, but we are beginning to think about how you govern, and that involves everyone sitting in this room. When you think about the teaching profession, it must be thought of in terms of an entity. How do you define and fix responsibility, how do you define and fix procedures in such a way that various groups are accountable for various dimensions of the governing of the profession?

I submit to you that one of the most tenacious problems in this regard relates to the whole problem of whatever we mean when we talk about credentialing, whatever we mean when we talk about accrediting institutions, or whatever we mean when we talk about developing performance criteria, which is a form of accountability. Classroom teachers, among others, are saying that they must be involved in who enters the profession, how they enter, and the criteria for staying in, if they are to be accountable. What teachers are saying is that there is a difference between delivering quality education and being personally accountable. Indeed, some of them are saying, "I can be personally accountable, but I can't possibly deliver services under the existing conditions." They are saying, therefore, that they want some sort of procedural arrangements whereby they have more control over those conditions.

Immediately, this gets us into a difficult dilemma, because people perceive in this that the teaching profession is attempting to take control of education. And our Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards keeps saying that we are not talking about controlling education, we are talking about governing the standards of our profession. I want it to be understood here that I am talking about the teaching profession as an entity and not as an organization. We need to be acutely aware that throughout the United States we already have some pilot approaches going, and teachers, organizations, unions and others are pursuing new kinds of legislation relative to government and the teaching profession based on some of the concepts that I just mentioned. Teachers are asking for some new powers if they are going to be held accountable for the conduct and ethical behavior of their colleagues. Their new privileges and rights are going to invade teacher education, state departments of education, and accrediting teams.

Since the teachers of this country, particularly the classroom teachers, happen to be our products, and if we do feel that there is an abberation of behavior or that something isn't going right, then it behooves us to take a pretty good look at the principle of involvement, a pretty important one in a democratic society. I think we're going to get a chance to say either "yes" or "no" to the propositions coming from that source, because they are coming and I think they need help; I think the people out in the public schools need great help and understanding. So my plea is to look at the totality of the situation, and perhaps set up some seminars in educational jurisprudence related to the governance of this profession.